

THE SEQUENCE OF TENSES IN LATIN

A Study Based on Caesar's Gallic War

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS, LITER-
ATURE, AND SCIENCE, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER

PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

(Printed also in the Kansas University Quarterly, Vol. VII, No. 4.)

LAWRENCE, KANSAS

1899

THE SEQUENCE OF TENSES IN LATIN

A Study Based on Caesar's Gallic War

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS, LITER-
ATURE, AND SCIENCE, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER

PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS



(Printed also in the Kansas University Quarterly, Vol. VII, No. 4.)

LAWRENCE, KANSAS

1899



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

CONTENTS.

The references are to pages.

Introduction.	1-5
Purpose of this study and its relation to Professor Hale's "Sequence of Tenses," 1. The method adopted, 3.	
Chapter I.	5-12
Meanings of indicative tenses, 5. Meanings of subjunctive tenses, 6. Treatment of participles and infinitives, 7. Combinations of tenses which may be said to be in sequence, 8. Reasons for prevalence of sequence, 9. Reasons for exceptions, 10. Miscellaneous points, 10.	
Chapter II. The descriptive imperfect and imperfect of repeated action.	12-19
The imperfect describing an act which began before the action of its principal verb and continued after it, 12. The imperfect describing an act which both began and stopped at the same time as the action of its principal verb, 16. The imperfect describing an act which lasted up to the time of its principal verb, 17. The imperfect describing an act which began at the time of its principal verb and continued beyond it, 18. The imperfect describing an act which began after the action of its principal verb began and ended before it ended, 18.	
Chapter III. The descriptive pluperfect.	19-23
The pluperfect describing a situation which began before the action of its principal verb and continued after it, 19. The pluperfect describing a situation which both began and ended at the same time as the action of its principal verb, 21. The pluperfect describing a situation which lasted up to the time of its principal verb, 22. The pluperfect describing a situation which began after the action of its principal verb began and stopped before it stopped, 23.	
Chapter IV. The aoristic pluperfect.	23-25
The pluperfect of an act which simply preceded the act of its principal verb, 23. The summarizing aoristic pluperfect of an act which both began and ended at the same time as the action of its principal verb, 24. The summarizing aoristic pluperfect of an act which lasted up to the action of its principal verb, 24.	
Chapter V. The past future and future perfect. ✓	25-30
Kinds of past future, 25. Constructions in which the past feeling is emphasized, 27. Constructions in which the idea of futurity is emphasized, 27. The spurious past future, 29. The past future in <i>quin</i> and <i>quominus</i> clauses, 30.	

Chapter VI. Some developed subjunctive constructions.	30-31
Chapter VII. Tenses of repeated action depending on similar tenses.	31-32
Chapter VIII. Presents, perfects, and futures.	33-34
Chapter IX. The remaining tenses in sequence.	35-39
Tenses whose lack of logical sequence is disguised by indirect discourse, 35. Idioms in which the subordinate clause is regularly of the same tense as the principal clause, 37. Clauses which are properly out of sequence but by happening to depend on presents are formally in sequence, 37. True sequence feeling triumphing over an idiom, 37. Formal sequence observed where the sense might lead one to expect an exception, 38. Tenses in sequence used peculiarly for others which would also have been in sequence, 38. Miscellaneous, 39. Summary of results so far obtained, 39.	
Chapter X. Exceptions to sequence,	40-44
Exceptions in the subjunctive, 40. Tense idioms which bring about exceptions in the indicative, 41. Indicative exceptions not resulting from a fixed idiom, 42.	
Chapter XI. Coordinate relative sentences and clauses,	45-46
Chapter XII. The proof of a sequence feeling,	47-52
Disproportion between indicative and subjunctive exceptions in certain constructions must be explained by sequence, 47. Theoretical ground for sequence feeling, 49. The results of an examination of other authors, 52.	

The Sequence of Tenses in Latin.

An Investigation Based on Cæsar's Gallic War.

BY ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER.

INTRODUCTION.

The object of my investigation is to determine just how far the tenses of the subjunctive correspond in meaning and usage to those of the indicative, and whether there is any mechanical "sequence of tenses" in the one mood which does not appear in the other. My theory of the uses of the tenses and the starting point of my investigation are furnished by Professor William Gardner Hale's papers on *The Sequence of Tenses*, in the *American Journal of Philology*, VII, 4 (1886); VIII, 1 (1887); IX, 2 (1888). In that study he takes the ground that the tenses of the Subjunctive always (or with very few exceptions)* have their own meanings and that there is no such thing as a mechanical sequence of tenses. As will appear later, I am led to agree fully with the first half of this proposition; but the second half does not necessarily follow, and with it I can not agree.

In a foot-note of his last paper Professor Hale makes the statement: "It has been my intention to prepare complete statistics of

*For these see A. J. P. VIII, pp. 54-56. This discussion of them is summarized in A. J. P. IX, pp. 18-19 of reprint, as follows:

"In a great number of cases of what is called the subjunctive 'by assimilation,' the modal feeling which in the main clause expresses itself in the subjunctive of a certain tense continues to exist, either unchanged in kind, or only slightly shaded, in the clauses attached to it, and is therefore expressed by the same mode, and by a tense that indicates the same point of view. But the frequent recurrence of such examples gives rise to the occasional use of a dependent subjunctive with only a formal likeness to the main subjunctive, and no true modal feeling; and it is the common opinion that in such cases the tense is likewise purely formal."

the uses of the tenses in dependent indicative clauses in the Gallic War, but other occupations oblige me to postpone the plan. I have already gone far enough, however, to warrant the statements made in the present paper." As he has never found it possible to carry out this plan, he has allowed me to undertake the work.

In its boldest and baldest form the "rule of the sequence" simply says that in subjunctive subordinate clauses primary tenses follow primary and secondary follow secondary, leaving a natural impression that the tenses of the subjunctive are meaningless and depend only formally on the tense of the main verb. This form of the doctrine is the one which Professor Hale set out to attack especially. It is safe to say that no one now advocates such a doctrine. Every one admits that the tenses of the subjunctive have some meaning, though there might be a difference of opinion as to the amount and kind of this meaning.* It is an undoubted fact that the tenses of the subjunctive do follow this rule in the great majority of cases. No one is prepared to say how far this is due to the logical relation of ideas in the sentence, as expressed by tense, and how far it is due to a 'mechanical blurring of these relationships by a formal sequence of tense. This is the question to the solution of which this paper is intended to contribute.

Professor Hale's method of attacking the doctrine in his first paper was to collect a large number of exceptions to the rule and show that in each case the tenses in them were used because they expressed what the writer had to say. Therefore the subjunctive tenses had meanings. Therefore it was fair to suppose that all subjunctives had tense force even if used in sequence. In his second paper he answered a number of objections to his own theory and adduced a number of positive arguments in its favor. For example, the aorist subjunctive may depend on a present, but verbs depending on it are usually in secondary sequence. This can not be explained by the rule, but is very simple on the theory that the tenses of the subjunctive have meaning. From this discussion he concluded that the "tenses of the Latin subjunctive, alike in dependent and in independent sentences, tell their own temporal story,—that no such thing as is meant by the doctrine of the sequence of tenses exists." This left his position open to attack on two sides. On the one side Professor Gildersleeve (*A. J. P.* Vol. VIII, p. 228)†

* It is unfortunate, however, that even the latest of the American grammars give but a scanty treatment of the meanings of the subjunctive tenses and still cling closely to the mechanical rule. This course may be pedagogically easier, and the admirable treatment of the tenses in Lattmann Mueller may be too full for pedagogical purposes, but the contrast is not creditable to our books.

† Professor Hale's reply to this is given in his third paper, which also gives a full treatment of the meanings of the subjunctive tenses.

argued that these exceptions did not necessarily prove more than that where the strain on tense meaning was too great an exception might occur, but in spite of these exceptions there was a certain amount of flattening out of the fine distinctions of tense in the subjunctive, due to sequence. And, on the other side, as I have already said, I hope to show at the end of this paper that, even granting that every tense of the subjunctive always has its own meaning, it would not necessarily follow that there was no such thing as sequence of tenses,—even a mechanical one.

A part of Professor Hale's purpose in his plan of collecting the statistics for the indicative tenses was to show that in the great majority of cases the indicative follows the rule of sequence, and that therefore it would not do to state a rule for the one mood more than for the other. He intended to do more than this, however. A simple enlargement of this plan would have been to count the exceptions in the subjunctive as well, and compare the two moods in that way. But this would not have been sufficient. After the work had been done it would still have been open for any one to say that in an unknown number of cases the subjunctive tenses had been flattened out in meaning. If, however, it is impossible to make out the exact meaning of each tense of the indicative and subjunctive, and the exact relationship of each subordinate tense to its principal verb, we can then see just how much of this flattening has taken place in the subjunctive over and above that which has befallen the indicative tenses. And this was the task Professor Hale had set himself, which I have endeavored to carry out.

My method has been as follows: I have made as careful an examination as possible of every tense in Cæsar's Gallic War. It seemed useless for my purpose to give statistics for the relations of the independent aorists, or most independent presents and futures to each other, and they have been cut out, though presents depending on aorists, etc., have of course been given. The paper is intended to include, therefore, all dependent indicatives and subjunctives, all independent indicatives whose relation to other verbs can be paralleled in dependent clauses, with the exception of aorists following aorists in consecutive narration. All these verbs have been classified in as minute subdivisions as seemed at all practicable, the independent indicatives, the dependent indicatives, and the subjunctives being kept separate. The classification is made as far as possible on the basis of distinctions of tense alone, not of the syntax of the clause; but some constructions are so peculiar in their meanings that it was necessary to keep them by themselves. These

groups have then been compared with each other to see how far the independent indicatives, the dependent indicatives, and the subjunctives correspond to one another. The future uses of the subjunctive correspond to nothing in the indicative. The effort here has been simply to make sure that each tense is or is not used in strict harmony with the statement of its use which is to be given presently. There then remain some subjunctive and many indicative verbs whose tenses are exceptions to the rule of sequence. These have been classified and explained so far as was possible.

I can not, of course, hope that anyone else who should subject the tenses of Cæsar to a careful scrutiny would classify the examples in every case as I have done, even if he were satisfied to use the same categories at all. After the first classification each of the examples has been given at least one careful and one more hasty examination, and each time some changes have been made; and I cannot doubt that in any number of further examinations I myself should each time make some further changes. This is especially true in the hopeless attempt to make a satisfactory separation of the imperfects of repeated action from the descriptive imperfects, and the aoristic pluperfects from the descriptive. But I do hope that I should be found to have treated the indicatives and subjunctives alike, so that where errors of judgment appeared in the treatment of one mood they would be found to be balanced by corresponding errors in the treatment of the other. In that case my classification will have served its chief end.

The study of the tenses in Cæsar's Gallic War is, of course, far from settling so broad a question as that of the sequence of tense, but it seems to me that from even so limited a field as this one can arrive at some probable conclusions. And, on the other hand, I am sure that the question can never be settled by bringing forward a miscellaneous mass of examples on either side, but must depend on the full and minute studies of individual authors.

In concluding this prefatory portion of my paper, I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Hale for the help and inspiration I have received from him in the line of syntactical study, both in his lecture room in the University of Chicago and in the subsequent relations which I bore to him as instructor in his department. No statement of my obligation to him in this respect could be beyond the truth.* The results of my paper bear out his main contention

* While apparently not regarded as a matter of much moment, I will add that my obligations extend even to terminology in some degree. *E. g.*, the term "volitive," which seems to be finding favor in some quarters, I at least got from him. Among others might be mentioned "determinative clause," "non-essential clause," "balancing clause."

most fully, though in some respects I can not wholly agree with him, and though I have naturally laid more stress on the points of divergence than on those of agreement. If my points are good, they are made with tools received from him. If they are bad, the fault is my own.

If I had felt that a dedication was in order, it would have been to him and to the other man who has most helped and influenced me; Chancellor James H. Kirkland, of Vanderbilt University, from whom I first received a decided impulse toward Latin studies. Though I have received from him no direct assistance toward this paper, it would certainly never have been written but for the inspiration received from him.

CHAPTER I.

My study of the meanings of the tenses leaves me in substantial agreement with Professor Hale's statement of them,* though with some difference in detail, and though I found a fuller discussion of the subjunctive tenses necessary. The statements that follow are intentionally brief, but cover the main points. Additional details are given as occasion arises later in the paper.

All tenses of the indicative express one or both of the following ideas: 1. The time-sphere of an act or state (past, present, or future). 2. The stage of advancement of the act or state in its time-sphere (completed, in process, or imminent). In addition, the tenses which express the stage usually imply relativity of time to the time of another verb (priority, contemporaneousness, or futurity).

Aoristic tenses simply state the act, etc., as an occurrence, giving only the time-sphere, not the stage. Those recognized by Professor Hale are the historical perfect (aorist proper), the aoristic present, and the aoristic future. I find it necessary, for a reason to be given more fully in speaking of the pluperfect, to include among the aoristic tenses the aoristic pluperfect. To be consistent, one must either call one use of the pluperfect aoristic, or else call the true aorist depending on a present a tense of stage. So, too, there is an aoristic future perfect as well as a future perfect of the stage.

The aorist, of course, has nothing to do with momentariness of action, but is often used to express in summary a long continued or repeated act.

Tenses of stage state the act as it was, is, or will be at a time which

*As given in his third paper on Sequence, in his *Cum-Constructions* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Part I, 1887, Part II, 1889), and especially in the advance sheets, printed in 1895, of his unfortunately still unpublished *Moods and Tenses*.

is in mind. They express both time-sphere and stage, and imply relativity. They are, for the past, the pluperfect, the imperfect, and the periphrastic; for the present, the present perfect, or true perfect, the present, and the periphrastic; for the future, the future perfect, the future, and the periphrastic. In this paper the imminent side of the periphrastic futures has been disregarded, and they have been classified with regard to the copula alone. Out of the use of the imperfect to represent an act as in process grow the conative imperfect, the imperfect of repeated action, and what is here called the persistent imperfect. By way of distinction from these latter imperfects, the ordinary imperfect is here called the descriptive imperfect.

The pluperfect has two quite distinct meanings, though it is not always possible to be sure of the force of a given example. It may represent a past situation resulting from a previous act, as, *e. g.*, in *convenerant*, "they had come together," *i. e.*, "were in meeting." Or it may represent an act which is over and done with at the time of the principal verb, as in *cuius pater regnum multos annos obtinuerat*, "had had" (but had no longer). Professor Hale seems to regard this latter use as a mere development of the other, for in speaking of the tenses of stage, after giving the former use of the pluperfect he says, "Since the activity itself must have been prior to the completed result, the pluperfect comes also to be used to denote an act as having taken place before the certain past time which the speaker or writer has in mind." It seems to me better to recognize the pluperfect as a past perfect, either a true perfect or an aorist. The past perfect proper is a tense of stage; the past aorist is not. The former, I call in this paper the descriptive pluperfect; the latter, the aoristic pluperfect.

Professor Hale's treatment of the subjunctive tenses in the published papers to which I have alluded is not satisfactory for my purpose. His statement of the uses of those tenses seems to me good for pedagogical purposes, but not sufficient for this investigation. His explanation of the origin of these uses seems to me to be put less definitely than one could wish, and is certainly less satisfactory than the treatment given the subject in the advance sheets of his *Moods and Tenses*.

His statement of uses is as follows: (A. J. P., Vol. VIII, p. 69). "In other words, in practical use each tense of the subjunctive is found to be employed with two distinct ideas, one that which is indicated by the tense of the indicative bearing the same name (as in indirect questions), the other a future idea (as in the final clause,

commands in indirect discourse, etc.); so that the so-called pluperfect and the so-called perfect serve, from their respective standpoint,* as either perfect or future perfect, and the so-called imperfect and present serve from their respective standpoints as either present or future." That is, the present serves as present or future; the imperfect as either imperfect or future to the past; the perfect as either perfect or future perfect, and the pluperfect as either pluperfect or future perfect to the past.

A fuller discussion of the relation of these two classes of meanings to each other may be reserved to a later portion of this paper. It will be sufficient for the present to say that the constructions in which the tense meanings correspond to those of the indicative are developments out of constructions in which the subjunctive has the other tense meanings. They are chiefly clauses of result, characterizing clauses, causal and adversative relative clauses, and *cum*-clauses; indirect questions and indirect discourse; the concessive subjunctive, either independent or with *quamvis* or *ut*.

In all these, except some result and characterizing clauses, the meanings of the tenses are the same as those laid down for the indicative. In his second paper (A. J. P., Vol. VIII, p. 49) Professor Hale has given what seems to me a satisfactory explanation of the familiar fact that in result clauses and characterizing clauses the imperfect is often used where a corresponding indicative construction would have required the aorist. In *tam fortiter pugnaverunt ut vincerent*, the result clause has developed its usual meaning of "so that they did conquer" out of an original "whereby they would naturally," in which the imperfect subjunctive has its proper meaning. But both tense and mood remained unchanged, though they had taken on a force which would naturally have been expressed by the aorist indicative.

In conditions and wishes, contrary to fact, the imperfect and and pluperfect have taken on a meaning of contrariety to fact in simple present and past time respectively. The explanation of this fact is too well understood to need repetition here.

Participles and infinitives express only the stage, taking their time-sphere from the principal verb. It was beside my purpose to treat of the tense uses of these forms for themselves; but where other verbs depend on them, they are treated as if depending on a corresponding indicative tense of stage. For example, an imperfect

*Professor Hale's use of the terms "standpoint" and "point of view" has been criticized on the ground that a tense can have but one standpoint or point of view, namely, the present time of the speaker or writer. I have accordingly used the term "point of reference," although I do not think that misunderstanding could arise from the use of his terms.

depending on a perfect participle which itself depends on a past tense, is classified as if it depended on a descriptive pluperfect

We have next to consider how the tenses behave in combination, and for my purpose it is especially important to ascertain just what is meant by the sequence of tense, and what combinations of indicatives with other verbs are to be regarded as falling under the same rule. Cæsar's narrative lies wholly in the past, with occasional digressions in the present. Therefore I lack examples for the future almost entirely, and I say nothing about certain troublesome points in the relations of futures with other tenses. I leave them in hopes that I may at some time be able to give some other author a thorough examination with reference to these points.

A consideration of all the cases in which a subjunctive can be said to follow another verb in sequence will, I believe, show that they all (except the result clauses and conditions contrary to fact which have already been spoken of) fall under the three following categories :

1. All tenses of stage that belong to the same time-sphere as the principal verb are said to be "in sequence." This includes, for instance, all descriptive imperfects and pluperfects depending on a past tense. But a tense of stage depending on a verb of a different time-sphere, as an imperfect depending on a present, is an exception.
2. The aorist is in sequence with a present, and the aoristic pluperfect with a past. The aorist is the tense the user of which, so to speak, stands in the present and looks back at the past. It is the natural link between the present time-sphere and the past. It is to be noted that the reverse does not hold good. A present or perfect depending on an aorist is out of sequence. So, too, an aorist depending on an aorist is out of sequence. The relations between a past and the aoristic pluperfect are precisely the same as those between the present and the aorist. The pluperfect depending on a past is in sequence. It is a mere accident of language that many imperfects and pluperfects depending on aoristic pluperfects are not exceptions in form as they are in logic. This pluperfect really looks back from a past time-sphere to another lying still further back ; but language does not possess a set of tenses to express the relations in that time-sphere. If there were such tenses it would be clear that only they could be in sequence with the aoristic pluperfect, and that an imperfect, for example, belonging to the usual past time-sphere is as much out of sequence with this pluperfect as is a present with an aorist. So, too, one aoristic pluperfect is as much out of sequence with another as one aorist with

another. But in both these cases language has to get along with the ordinary tenses of the past time-sphere, and on the surface the sequence appears as regular as if the pluperfect were descriptive.

3. A subjunctive with future meaning is in sequence if its "point of reference," past or present, belongs to the time-sphere of the principal verb. That is, a future from the past (imperfect) is in sequence with a past verb.

In the indicative the third category does not appear; but the other two can be applied directly to the indicative, and in what follows tenses of these kinds will be spoken of as in sequence.

In such a narrative as Cæsar's the great majority of the independent verbs are aorists; and the dependent ones, both indicative and subjunctive, are imperfects and pluperfects. The reason is this. When a man thinks of any series of events his mind selects certain ones which seem to him to stand forth as the salient points in the series. To these he looks back from the present as occurrences, and he expresses them by the appropriate tense, the aorist. But the same reason, that they are the salient points, leads him to express them in independent sentences. In connection with these salient points and, so to speak, grouped around them he thinks of other events which seem to him of subordinate interest except as they influenced the main events, or he thinks of natural phenomena as present during those events, or of men's feelings during them, etc. Now, all these things he naturally thinks of as they were at the time of his important events. That means that he will express them by the proper tenses of the stage. But for the same reasons he will usually make subordinate clauses of them, though he may put them in independent sentences, and always will do so if they are too many in number to make a satisfactory complex sentence.

He may also think of other events as having occurred previously to the event of which he is speaking. If they seem to him of independent interest, he looks at them from the present and expresses this attitude by the use of the aorist. But this same feeling will usually lead him to make an independent sentence. If, however, they are thought of in connection with the event of which he is speaking, he will use the aoristic pluperfect and will naturally make a subordinate clause of the statement.

The constructions which contain the future use of the subjunctive are such that only a very few of them can be thought of except in relation to the time of their main verbs. A command, for instance, can hardly be thought of except in relation to the time of the verb of commanding on which it depends; though it is true that after a

past tense the command may retain the original present, by *representatio*. But this is in no sense an exception to sequence.

It seems, then, to be entirely in accordance with the natural workings of the mind that while the principal verbs in a narrative are aorists in the majority of cases, the subordinate ones are regularly imperfects and pluperfects. But there are two other possibilities.

The writer may, though he looks at a subordinate act aoristically, choose to speak of it in a subordinate clause.

He may also wish to give a still existing reason for a past act, or a still existing result of it, etc. Then he will use a present or a perfect, whether his choice is for a dependent or an independent mode of expression.

Both of these usages are, of course, exceptions to the rule of sequence. One of the chief objects of this paper is to show how the ratio of exceptions to regular uses in the indicative compares with the corresponding ratio in the subjunctive, and so far as possible to explain the difference. No one would doubt that many more exceptions are to be expected in the indicative. Professor Hale has taken the ground that this discrepancy is accounted for wholly by the fact that the indicative constructions are in the mass less closely connected in thought with the main clause than are the subjunctive ones. How far this explains the facts is to be discussed later.

Before proceeding to my detailed classification, it is necessary to speak briefly of a number of more or less disconnected points.

The text used is that of Dinter's edition.

Where my headings speak of the "act" of a verb, the expression must be understood to mean "act or state," according to the meaning of the verb.

The treatment of co-ordinate relative clauses was a point of difficulty. Some of them are entirely independent sentences, while others are close to subordinate clauses. I finally decided to treat all relatives which are to be translated by "and he" or "but he," etc., as if *et* or *sed*, etc., had actually been used. Consequently, such clauses or sentences are given under independent sentences, or as if co-ordinate with subordinate verbs. That this is not strictly in accord with Cæsar's feeling, is shown by the frequency with which he uses subjunctives instead of infinitives in such clauses when put into indirect discourse. I have, therefore, given a separate list of these relative constructions in Chap. XI.

I have invariably treated the historical present as if it were the aorist or imperfect for which it is used.

The treatment of *repræsentatio* in indirect discourse is the same. Presents and perfects depending on a past are given as if they were the imperfects and pluperfects for which they stand.

Consuevi, cognovi, and similar verbs and participles, though practically present in meaning, have been classified as present perfects, etc.

Those result clauses in which the tenses seemed equivalent in meaning to the corresponding tenses of the indicative have been given a corresponding classification. The rest will be found in Chap. VI.

When the "principal verb" for another verb is spoken of, the principal verb of the sentence is, of course, not necessarily intended, for a subordinate verb may have another verb depending on it, and be its principal verb.

Only subordinate finite verbs are classified; but they may depend on participles, infinitives, and even adjectives and nouns. These participles and infinitives, etc., are included according to the same headings as the finite verbs, so that where a verb is said to depend on a descriptive imperfect, for example, it may be found to depend on a present infinitive, an adjective, etc. Perhaps this will be especially noted where a verb is said to follow a past future.

All through the subdivisions the capitals A, B, and C have been used to denote respectively independent indicatives, dependent indicatives, and dependent subjunctives.

No independent indicatives have intentionally been given unless the relation between them and the principal verb, if one may call it so, is fairly clear. Those that are given serve to show the identity of independent tense usage with dependent.

The ratio of indicatives to subjunctives in each single category is of little consequence for my purpose.

My figures are the result of counting all the verbs, rather than the number of sentences in which the construction appears.

CHAPTER II.

THE DESCRIPTIVE IMPERFECT AND IMPERFECT OF REPEATED ACTION.

The imperfect of repeated action is really only a species of descriptive imperfect; instead of a single act lasting on during or up to another we have a series of acts lasting in the same way. As a development of this use the imperfect is occasionally used to express repeated action in situations in which but for the idea of repetition the aorist would have been used. But in Cæsar, at least, I find no such case outside of independent sentences.

The larger subdivisions of this chapter are made on the basis of the relation of the times of the two acts involved to each other. The examples under each of the heads thus made are further subdivided according to the tense meaning of the verbs on which they depend. Where examples of the imperfect of repeated action exist they are given immediately after the corresponding descriptive imperfects.

I. The imperfect describing an act which began before the action of its principal verb and continued after it.

1. The descriptive imperfect following* an aorist.

Example: I, 11, 2, cum se defendere non possent, legatos mittunt; since they were not able to defend themselves they sent envoys.

A. I, 2, 4; 2, 5; 4, 1; 6, 3; 6, 4; 7, 2; 7, 4 (2); 9, 1 (2); 9, 3 (4); 10, 2, 11, 1; 12, 1; 12, 4; 18, 1; 19, 1 and 2 (2); 25, 3; 29, 2; 33, 2; 38, 2; 40, 15; 42, 2 (2); 43, 1 (2); 46, 3; 47, 3; 48, 5; 49, 3; 52, 6. II, 5, 6; 6, 1; 6, 3; 7, 4; 10, 5; 15, 3; 17, 4; 19, 1 (2); 23, 3; 29, 3 (2); 29, 4. III, 10, 1; 14, 2; 16, 3; 17, 1 and 2 (2); 18, 6; 19, 1; 20, 1. IV, 4, 2 (2); 6, 4; 9, 3; 11, 4; 13, 2 and 3 (3); 17, 2; 20, 4; 22, 4; 26, 1; 29, 4 (2). V, 3, 2; 6, 1; 28, 1 (2); 34, 2 (2); 42, 2 (2); 44, 1 and 2 (3); 45, 2; 48, 1; 49, 1; 49, 6 (2); 57, 1 (2); 58, 4. VI, 3, 5 (2); 5, 5; 7, 5 (3); 9, 2 (2); 34, 7; 35, 1 (2); 35, 3. VII, 10, 1; 11, 4; 15, 2; 17, 1; 19, 2 (2); 26, 2; 35, 2; 36, 2-4 (3); 36, 5; 39, 2; 43, 5; 45, 4 (2); 46, 1 (2); 48, 4 (2); 50, 2; 55, 10; 56, 2; 59, 3 and 4 (3); 62, 1; 62, 5 (4); 65, 1; 73, 1; 76, 5; 77, 1; 79, 3; 83, 2; 83, 3. Total, 139. B. I, 3, 5 (2); 4, 2; 5, 3; 7, 3; 8, 1; 10, 3; 11, 5; 15, 1; 18, 1; 19, 3; 21, 4; 23, 1 (2); 25, 5; 25, 6 (2); 28, 3; 28, 5; 32, 1; 39, 2; 42, 5 (2); 51, 1; 52, 7; 52, 7; 53, 6; 54, 2. II, 2, 3; 12, 1; 12, 3; 15, 1 (2); 19, 6; 19, 8; 21, 3; 28, 2; 33, 2; 35, 2. III, 1, 2; 6, 4; 7, 3; 8, 2; 9, 1; 9, 3; 9, 8; 18, 1; 22, 1; 23, 5; 27, 2; 28, 1; 28, 2 (2). IV, 12, 1; 13, 5; 13, 6; 20, 1 and 2 (2); 21, 3; 21, 7 (3); 22, 3; 22, 6; 25, 1; 25, 3; 30, 2; 32, 1; 32, 2; 35, 1; 36, 2. V, 4, 1; 4, 3 (2); 9, 7 (2); 11, 5; 22, 1; 23, 2; 23, 5; 24, 4; 33, 5; 37, 1; 38, 1; 41, 1; 46, 1; 47, 2; 49, 7; 58, 4. VI, 4, 2; 4, 3; 7, 7; 30, 1; 36, 2; 38, 3. VII, 1, 2; 4, 2; 5, 2; 7, 4; 9, 4; 11, 6; 13, 2; 13, 3 (2); 27, 1; 33, 1; 35, 5; 37, 1; 38, 9; 40, 5; 43, 4; 44, 2;

*It is hardly necessary to say that the word "following" is not used here to mean following in the order of arrangement, but in the sense of depending on.

47, 1; 47, 4; 47, 7; 54, 2 (2); 55, 7; 60, 2; 61, 4; 63, 7 (3); 64, 7; 65, 4 (2); 70, 6; 75, 5; 77, 12; 83, 4; 84, 4; 87, 3. Total, 132. C. I, 9, 2; 11, 2; 16, 6; 20, 6 (3); 21, 2; 22, 1 (2); 23, 3 (2); 26, 1; 32, 3; 40, 1; 42, 6; 45, 1. II, 2, 2; 5, 2; 13, 2; 13, 3; 17, 2; 17, 5; 19, 5; 26, 2 (2); 28, 1; 29, 4. III, 1, 1; 1, 6; 5, 1 (3); 10, 3; 15, 2; 18, 2; 18, 3; 25, 1 and 2 (5); 26, 1; 29, 2 (-). IV, 4, 4; 7, 2; 11, 1; 14, 2; 14, 3; 15, 1; 23, 5; 28, 2 (2); 29, 3; 30, 1 (2); 34, 5; 37, 2; 38, 2. V, 2, 3; 3, 3; 3, 5; 10, 2; 18, 5; 22, 4 (2); 33, 3; 37, 5; 44, 3; 47, 5; 48, 2 (2); 49, 8; 56, 5; 58, 6. VI, 1, 4; 2, 2; 2, 3; 7, 8; 31, 1; 31, 5; 35, 7; 39, 1. VII, 1, 3; 2, 2; 6, 1; 11, 5; 12, 4; 15, 3; 19, 4; 25, 1 (2); 27, 1; 28, 3; 31, 4; 32, 2 (2); 37, 7; 38, 1; 45, 7; 45, 9; 49, 1; 52, 2; 53, 2; 66, 2; 82, 2; 83, 5; 83, 8; 85, 1; 87, 1; 87, 3. Total, 111.

2. The imperfect of repeated action following an aorist. Example: II, 19, 5, *cum se identidem reciperent*, &c., *legiones castra munire coeperunt*; while they kept retreating, &c., the legions began to make a camp.

A. IV, 26, 3 (3); VII, 59, 1 (3); 73, 1. Total, 7. B. I, 39, 1; IV, 7, 1; V, 1, 5; 2, 4 (3); VII, 24, 5 (2). Total, 8. C. I, 42, 4; II, 19, 5 (2); VII, 25, 1 (2). Total, 5.

3. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: II, 5, 5, *post eum quae essent tuta ab hostibus reddebat*; rendered safe from the enemy all that was in his rear.

A. I, 6, 1; 38, 3 (2); II, 9, 1; III, 13, 1; 13, 6; 14, 4; 14, 8; 24, 2-3 (2); IV, 20, 2; 24, 2; V, 7, 1; VI, 5, 4 (2); 7, 5; VII, 19, 1 (2); 59, 5 (3). Total, 21. B. I, 7, 4; 19, 5; 38, 3; II, 19, 5; 23, 4; 24, 3; III, 9, 3; 14, 3; 14, 9; 17, 7; 25, 1; IV, 17, 2; 18, 4; 29, 4; 30, 1; V, 28, 1 (2); 42, 2; 54, 5; VI, 5, 3; VII, 26, 2 (2); 37, 6; 45, 4; 62, 4; 77, 1. Total, 26. C. I, 14, 1; 16, 5; 16, 6; 18, 9; 31, 2; 34, 4; 35, 2; 39, 6; 40, 6; 44, 6; II, 4, 1 (2); 4, 8 (2); 5, 5; 21, 3; 31, 2; III, 2, 1; 17, 7; IV, 7, 4; 7, 5; 8, 3 (3); 20, 4 (5); 32, 1; V, 27, 4; 27, 9; 29, 7; 31, 5 (2); 33, 3; 35, 5; 40, 7; 41, 5; 54, 1; VI, 10, 1; 36, 2; VII, 6, 2; 20, 7; 31, 2; 52, 3; 89, 2. Total, 47.

4. The descriptive imperfect following an imperfect of repeated action. Example: II, 1, 1, *cum esset in Gallia, crebri rumores afferebantur*; while he was in Gaul, rumors kept coming to him.

A. I, 16, 2-3 (3); II, 22, 2; III, 12, 1. Total, 5. B. I, 39, 5 (2); II, 1, 3 (2); III, 12, 3; 14, 8; IV, 31, 2; VI, 12, 7; VII, 73, 9; 80, 4. Total, 10. C. I, 59, 4; II, 1, 1; 8, 1 (2); 11, 5 (2); 30, 3; III, 3, 2 (2); 14, 7. Total, 10.

5. The imperfect of repeated action following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 47, 4, *propter linguae Gallicae scientiam, qua Ariovistus utebatur*; because of his knowledge of the Gallic language, which Ariovistus was in the habit of using.

B. I, 47, 4. Total, 1.

6. The imperfect of repeated action following an imperfect of repeated action. Example: II, 1, 3-4, *quod sollicitarentur ab nonnullis quod a potentioribus vulgo regna occupabantur*; because they were being constantly urged by some because the royal power was regularly siezed upon by stronger men.

B. II, 1, 4. Total, 1.

7. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive pluperfect, and extending beyond both the act and the resulting state. Example: II, 11, 2, *qua de causa discederent, nondum perspexerat*: he had not yet ascertained why they were leaving.

A. III, 2, 5; IV, 23, 3 (2); V, 6, 2; 18, 3; VII, 55, 1. Total, 6. B. 4, 16, 5. II, 12, 2; 22, 1; 29, 4; 32, 4; 35, 3; III, 2, 3; 2, 4; 6, 2, 7, 1, 20, 3; 26, 2, 26, 6. IV, 22, 2 (3); 22, 3; 29, 4; 32, 1; 32, 2; 32, 4. V, 3, 4; 25, 4; 52, 1 (2); VI, 1, 5. 32, 5; VII, 17, 1; 36, 1; 36, 2; 44, 1; 46, 3; 69, 5; 88, 1. Total, 34. C. I, 31, 10; 32, 2; 44, 12; II, 3, 4; 11, 2; 14, 3; 16, 4 (2); 26, 4; 26, 5 (2); 28, 2. IV, 12, 1; 19, 3; V, 29, 6; 58, 1; VI, 29, 4; VII, 1, 1; 18, 1; 38, 4; 62, 6. Total, 21.

8. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive pluperfect of repeated action. Example: III, 14, 6, *cum funes qui antemnas ad malos destinabant comprehensi erant*; whenever the ropes which bound the sail yards to the mast had been grappled.

B. III, 12, 2; 14, 6. Total, 2.

9. The descriptive imperfect of an act whose time includes the act of a descriptive pluperfect, but not the resulting situation. Example: II, 33, 6, *refractis portis, cum iam defenderet nemo*; having broken down the gates, since there were no longer any defenders.

B. II, 33, 2. III, 15, 3; 17, 4. VI, 12, 6; 41, 1. VII, 8, 1. Total, 6. C. II, 17, 4; 33, 6. VI, 12, 2. Total, 3.

10. The descriptive imperfect following an aoristic pluperfect and including the times of both the pluperfect and its principal verb. Example: VII, 47, 2, *milites non exaudito tubae sono, quod satis magna valles intercedebat retinebantur*; the soldiers not having heard the trumpet, because quite a large valley lay between, were kept in their position.

A. I, 18, 10. Total, 1. B. I, 8, 4; 41, 4. VII, 47, 2. Total, 3. C. II, 3, 5 (2). VII, 20, 3; 33, 3 (2). Total, 5.

11. The descriptive imperfect including the time of an aoristic pluperfect, but not that of the principal verb of the sentence. Example: I, 13, 5, *quod adortus esset cum ii qui flumen transissent auxilium ferre non possent, ne ipsos despiceret*; because he had made his attack at a time when those across the river could not give aid, he must not despise them.

B. I, 40, 5. VII, 20, 3. Total, 2. C. (The disproportion between the number of indicatives and subjunctives is the result of this being a common indirect discourse form of the direct imperfect following an aorist). I, 13, 5; 14, 2 (2); 20, 2; 29, 1; 31, 4; 31, 9; 40, 5; 43, 5. V, 10, 2; 27, 6. VII, 38, 5; 41, 2; 52, 1. Total, 14.

12. The imperfect of repeated action including the time of an

aoristic pluperfect, but not that of the principal verb of the sentence. Example: VII, 41, 2, *summis copiis castra oppugnata demonstrant, cum crebro integri defessis succederent*; they stated that the camp had been attacked by large numbers, with fresh men continually taking the place of tired.

C. VII, 41, 2. Total, 1.

13. The descriptive imperfect following an imperfect in result. Example: II, 35, 1, *tanta opinio perlata est uti ab iis nationibus quae trans Rhenum incolerent mitterentur legati*; such a report was spread that envoys were sent by the nations which lived across the Rhine.

B. V, 43, 5; 51, 3. Total, 2. C. (The preponderance of subjunctives is due to attraction). II, 35, 1. III, 15, 4. V, 23, 3; 23, 4; 44, 13; 53, 1. VI, 37, 2; 43, 5. VII, 36, 4. Total, 9.

14. The descriptive imperfect following a past future and including the times of both the principal verb and the future act. Example: I, 6, 3, *Allobrogibus sese persuasuros, quod viderentur, existimabant*; they thought they should persuade the Allobroges, because they seemed, etc.

B. I, 42, 5. II, 8, 4; 20, 1. III, 9, 3. IV, 4, 7. V, 1, 4; 7, 1 and 2 (2); 11, 4. VI, 33, 4; 34, 6; 34, 7. VII, 19, 6; 31, 4; 78, 1; 81, 2 (2). Total, 17. C. (The preponderance of subjunctives is due to attraction and indirect discourse). I, 3, 1; 6, 3; 7, 3; 7, 5; 14, 6; 15, 1; 17, 2; 17, 3; 20, 4; 21, 1; 28, 1; 31, 2; 31, 14; 31, 15; 33, 4; 34, 2; 34, 3; 36, 7; 37, 2; 40, 1; 40, 13; 40, 14; 43, 9; 47, 1; 47, 4; 48, 2; 48, 3. II, 2, 3. III, 6, 1; 8, 5; 21, 1; 26, 3. IV, 8, 3; 14, 1; 16, 6; 19, 2; 23, 5; 37, 1. V, 6, 3 (2); 27, 9; 29, 6; 36, 2; 36, 3; 41, 6; 41, 8; 43, 6; 46, 3; 51, 2; 52, 6. VI, 1, 2, 9, 7; 10, 3. VII, 8, 4; 14, 5; 14, 9; 15, 4; 15, 5; 19, 5; 26, 3; 30, 4; 33, 2; 37, 7; 71, 1; 72, 2; 75, 1; 77, 2. Total, 67.

15. The descriptive imperfect following a past future perfect and including the times both of it and the principal verb. Example: VII, 39, 4, *quod futurum provideat si se tot hominum milia cum hostibus coniunxerint quorum salutem neque propinqui negligere —posset*; which he saw would happen if so many thousand should join the enemy, whose safety their relatives could not neglect.

C. VII, 39, 4. Total, 1.

16. The imperfect of repeated action following a past future perfect, and including the times of both of it and the principal verb. Example: II, 31, 3, *si pro sua clementia, quam ab aliis audirent, statuisset Aduatucos esse conservandos, ne se armis despoliaret*; if in his kindness, of which they used to hear, he should have decided to save the lives of the Aduatuci, let him not take away their arms.

C. II, 31, 3. Total, 1.

17. The descriptive imperfect following a past future and including the time of its principal verb, but not that of the future event. Example: V, 6, 5, *id esse consilium, ut quos in conspectu Galliae interficere vereretur, hos in Britanniam traductos necaret*; this was the plan, to kill in Britain those whom he feared to kill in Gaul.

B. III, 11, 2. V, 5, 4; 46, 5. VI, 33, 3; 33, 4. VII, 21, 3; 56, 2. Tot31, 7. C. I, 14, 6; 27, 2. IV, 11, 3. V, 6, 5; 38, 4, 47, 4. VI, 7, 6; 40, 2. VII, 6, 3; 66, 5. Total, 10.

II. The imperfect describing an act which both began and stopped at the same time as the action of its principal verb.

1. The descriptive imperfect following a summarizing aorist. Example: I, 15, 5, *ita dies XV iter fecerunt ut inter hostium agmen et nostrum non amplius quinque milibus passuum interesset*; they marched for fifteen days in such a way that there were not more than five miles between the two armies.

A. I, 39, 3-4 (2). VII, 17, 2; 44, 3. Total, 4. B. IV, 1, 2 (2). V, 39, 4 (2); 50, 2. VII, 40, 2. Total, 6. C. I, 15, 5. II, 11, 1 (2); 33, 4. III, 15, 3; 17, 6; 21, 1 (2); 29, 2 (2). IV, 16, 1; 21, 9; 29, 1; 31, 3; 34, 4 (2). V, 16, 1, 18, 5; 31, 4; 58, 1. VII, 24, 1; 28, 4; 30, 4; 63, 7 (2). Total, 25.

2. The imperfect of repeated action following a summarizing aorist. Example: II, 11, 4, *multitudinem conciderunt, cum ab extremo agmine consisterent, etc.*; they killed many, since those in the rear would keep making a stand, etc.

A. I, 39, 3-6 (6). III, 3, 3. Total, 7. B. I, 26, 3 (3). Total, 3. C. II, 11, 4 (3); 27, 3 (4); 33, 4. V, 33, 6; 55, 2. VI, 24, 1 (3). Total, 13.

3. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 2, 4, *his rebus fiebat ut minus facile finitimis bellum inferre possent*; the result was that they were able, etc.

A. I, 2, 4; 6, 1; 19, 3; 33, 2; 33, 3-4 (3); 48, 5-7 (2). II, 6, 3; 18, 1-3 (5); 19, 2, 3 (3). III, 9, 4-7 (3); 10, 1. IV, 13, 1; 17, 1; 31, 1. V, 16, 4, 24, 7. VI, 34, 3; 34, 4-5 (6). VII, 6, 3 (2). Total, 37. B. I, 2, 5; 33, 2 (2); 46, 3; 52, 7. II, 8, 2 (4); 19, 2; 20, 3. III, 2, 5 (2); 24, 2. IV, 22, 4, 24, 2 (4); 26, 1. V, 34, 2; 49, 6. VI, 12, 2 (2); 36, 1 (2); 43, 6. VII, 15, 2 (2); 17, 2 (2); 50, 2; 56, 2, 80, 2; 80, 5 (2). Total, 36. C. I, 2, 2; 2, 4; 3, 6; 6, 1 (2); 14, 3, 14, 4 (2); 17, 1 (2); 18, 3; 19, 1 (2); 23, 1; 29, 2; 30, 4; 32, 2; 32, 4; 32, 5; 35, 2 (3); 36, 2; 36, 4; 38, 4; 40, 8; 40, 10 (2); 42, 2; 43, 8; 44, 4 (2); 44, 8; 45, 3 (2). II, 1, 2; 4, 3; 5, 5; 6, 3; 15, 4; 17, 4; 18, 2; 20, 3; 22, 1; 22, 2; 25, 1; 29, 3. III, 14, 4; 14, 8; 17, 5 (2); 20, 1; 28, 1. IV, 7, 5; 8, 2; 16, 4; 16, 7, 23, 3; 23, 5; 29, 4. V, 4, 1; 6, 5; 11, 2; 16, 1 (2); 26, 4; 27, 3; 41, 5 (3); 42, 3; 44, 1; 57, 1. VI, 1, 3; 12, 9 (2); 32, 1; 34, 1; 35, 3; 36, 2. VII, 1, 7 (2); 11, 4; 14, 3 (2); 14, 10; 19, 4; 19, 5; 20, 5; 20, 7; 24, 4; 29, 3; 32, 3 (2); 33, 2; 35, 1; 37, 3; 37, 6; 41, 2; 45, 4; 47, 3; 52, 3; 57, 4 (2); 64, 2; 72, 1; 76, 5; 77, 1; 80, 4 (2); 85, 2. Total, 113.

4. The descriptive imperfect following an imperfect of repeated action. Example: I, 32, 5, *Ariovisti crudelitatem horrent*,

quod reliquis fugae facultas daretur, etc.; they used to shudder at the cruelty of Ariovistus, because the rest had a chance to flee, etc.

A. III, 4, 3; 13, 6-7 (3). Total, 4. B. III, 12, 3. VII, 25, 1 (2). Total, 3. C. I, 32, 5 (2). V, 33, 1. Total, 3.

5. The imperfect of repeated action following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 2, 4, his rebus fiebat ut vagarentur; the result of all this was that they were in the habit of roaming about, etc.

A. I, 48, 5-6 (4). IV, 31, 2 (3). Total, 7. B. I, 25, 3. III, 4, 3 (2). IV, 26, 1. VI, 36, 1. Total, 5. C. I, 2, 4; 6, 1; 32, 4; 48, 7; 50, 4. II, 1, 3. III, 12, 1; 13, 7 (3); 14, 4; 17, 5. IV, 24, 3 (2). V, 16, 4 (4); 19, 3 (2). VII, 14, 6; 35, 1. Total 22.

6. The imperfect of repeated action following an imperfect of repeated action (not including the cases where each act of one verb is related to an act of the other; cf. Chap. VII). Example: V, 16, 2, intellectum est equites magno cum periculo dimicare, quod cederent, etc.; it was found that the cavalry fought at great risks, because the enemy would retreat, etc.

A. I, 39, 1. III, 4, 4; 13, 6 (2). Total, 4. B. VII, 16, 3. Total 1. C. III, 12, 1. V, 16, 2 (3). Total, 4.

7. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: I, 13, 2, commoti, cum intellegent, etc.; smitten with fear, because they understood, etc.

A. V, 6, 2 (2). Total, 2. B. III, 19, 2. V, 7, 3; 9, 1. VII, 43, 3; 77, 2. Total, 5. C. I, 13, 2; 14, 2; 27, 4; 31, 10; 33, 5; 39, 3. II, 17, 4; 25, 1; 25, 3; 32, 4. III, 2, 2. IV, 17, 7; 32, 1 (2). V, 17, 3; 35, 5; 54, 5. VI, 43, 3. VII, 17, 3; 47, 4; 54, 4; 55, 10; 56, 4. Total, 23.

8. The imperfect of repeated action following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: V, 55, 4, tantam auctoritatem comparaverat ut ad eum legationes concurrerent; he had acquired such power that envoys kept coming to him.

A. V, 53, 4 (3). Total, 4. B. VI, 36, 2. VII, 73, 1. Total, 2. C. V, 55, 4 (2). Total, 2.

9. The descriptive imperfect following an imperfect in result. Example: V, 43, 4, tanta militum virtus fuit ut, cum flamma torrerentur de vallo decederet nemo; such was the bravery of the soldiers that, although they were scorched by the flames, no one left the rampart.

C. V, 43, 4 (3). Total, 3.

III. The imperfect describing an act which lasted up to the time of its principal verb (most of these could have been replaced by the pluperfect).

1. The descriptive imperfect following an aorist. Example: I, 4, 3, *cum civitas ius suum exsequi conaretur, Orgetorix mortuus est*; while the state was trying to execute its laws, Orgetorix died.

A. II, 9, 1-2 (3). III, 24, 1-4 (4). IV, 24, 4. V, 25, 1; 32, 1; 35, 5 (2). VI, 8, 2. VII, 37, 6; 80, 2-5 (3). Total, 17. B. I, 10, 3. IV, 29, 3; 34, 3. V, 33, 6; 40, 2; 43, 6. VI, 8, 6; 8, 7; 29, 2; VII, 3, 1; 8, 2; 65, 5. Total, 12. C. I, 4, 3 (2); 20, 5; 53, 5. III, 7, 1; 24, 5. IV, 12, 5; 37, 1. V, 30, 1. VII, 24, 2 (3); 50, 1 (2); 51, 1; 80, 6. Total, 16.

2. The imperfect of repeated action following an aorist. Example: I, 32, 3, *cum ab his saepius quaereret, Divitiacus respondit*; on his repeatedly questioning them, Divitiacus replied.

A. VII, 25, 2; 80, 3-4 (2). Total, 3. C. I, 32, 3. Total, 1.

3. The descriptive imperfect following an imperfect. Example: II, 24, 1, *cum se in castra reciperent, adversis hostibus occurrebant*; while retreating to camp they met the enemy face to face.

C. II, 24, 1. Total, 1.

4. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: II, 29, 1, *cum venirent, hac pugna nuntiata reverterunt*; having heard of this battle while they were on the way, they went home.

A. VII, 25, 3; 36, 5-6 (2). Total, 3. B. VI, 30, 2. VII, 8, 3. Total, 2. C. II, 29, 1; IV, 28, 3. Total, 2.

5. The descriptive imperfect following an aoristic pluperfect. Example: II, 4, 2, *Gallos qui ea loca incolerent expulisse*; had driven out the Gauls who were living there.

B. III, 17, 3. VII, 4, 1; 68, 3. Total, 3. C. II, 4, 2. Total, 1.

6. The descriptive imperfect following a past future, and lasting up to the future event. Example: I, 35, 3, *obsides quos haberet ab Aeduis redderet*; he was to return the Aeduan hostages whom he was holding.

B. I, 7, 2. II, 9, 4; 9, 5. Total, 3. C. I, 35, 3 (2). IV, 11, 4; 10, 5. VII, 17, 4; 29, 6. Total, 6.

IV. The imperfect describing an act which began at the time of its principal verb and continued beyond it.

1. The imperfect following an aorist. Example: VII, 72, 1, *fossam directis lateribus duxit, ut eius fossae solum tantundem pateret*, etc.; he dug a ditch with vertical sides, so that the bottom was as wide as the top.

A. II, 5, 5 (3). Total, 3. C. IV, 31, 3. VII, 72, 1. Total, 2.

V. The imperfect describing an act which began after the action of its principal verb began and ended before it ended.

1. The descriptive imperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 44, 9, non tam barbarum esse ut non sciret; he was not so much of a barbarian that he was ignorant, etc.

B. II, 7, 4; 17, 4. Total, 2. C. I, 44, 9. V, 27, 4. VII, 69, 1. Total, 3.

2. The descriptive imperfect following the descriptive pluperfect: Example: III, 9, 6, neque eorum locorum ubi bellum gesturi essent vada novisse; and they had not become acquainted with the shoals of the places in which they were about to fight.

B. V, 9, 4. Total, 1. C. III, 9, 6. Total 1.

Totals for Chapter, A, 274; B, 335; C, 546.

CHAPTER III.

THE DESCRIPTIVE PLUPERFECT.

Since this is equally a descriptive tense, it naturally may be classified under much the same larger and smaller subdivisions as the imperfect. Probably no two men would agree on the classification of some of the examples that lie between the descriptive and aoristic pluperfects, for there is no sharp line between them, just as there is none between the perfect and the aorist. Almost every act that has taken place before another has left some influence behind it, and hence might be called descriptive. On the other hand, even where the resulting situation still lasts on, the thought of the writer may dwell strongly on the priority of the act, and the tense might be called aoristic. I have tried to steer as fair a course as possible between them; and even if others should take exception to my general conception of the difference between them, I have at least treated the indicative and subjunctive alike.

I. The pluperfect describing a situation which began before the action of its principal verb and continued after it.

1. The pluperfect following an aorist. Example: I, 27, 3, servos qui ad eos perfugissent poposcit; he demanded the slaves who had fled to them.

A. I, 11, 1 (2); 39, 7; 40, 15. II, 8, 5; 14, 1; 23, 1. III, 7, 2; 17, 2; 17, 4. IV, 6, 4; 9, 3; 14, 5 (2); 18, 4 (3); 29, 4. V, 5, 4; 6, 1; 8, 6 (2); 42, 2. VI, 32, 5; 36, 3; 38, 1 (2). VII, 36, 2; 39, 1; 46, 3 (2); 62, 1; 65, 1; 76, 1 (3). Total, 36. B. I, 5, 4 (2); 8, 1; 8, 3; 10, 3; 12, 2; 21, 2; 22, 5; 24, 3; 29, 1; 43, 2 (2); 49, 1; 49, 4; 52, 2; 53, 4 (2); 53, 6. II, 10, 3; 10, 5; 11, 6; 19, 5; 19, 6 (3); 23, 1; 33, 2 (3); 33, 7. III, 6, 1; 6, 4 (2); 11, 5; 17, 1; 19, 4; 26, 2; 28, 1. IV, 4, 6; 6, 1; 11, 1; 11, 6; 15, 4; 16, 2 (2); 21, 4; 21, 7; 28, 1; 30, 1; 38, 1 (2); 38, 3. V, 1, 1; 1, 2; 7, 9; 8, 2; 11, 1; 23, 2; 24, 1; 24, 4; 25, 5; 28, 1; 40, 2; 42, 5; 43, 1; 47, 3; 48, 7; 52, 4; 53, 3; 53, 6. VI, 30, 1, 32, 6. 35, 6 (2); 35, 10; 36, 3; 36, 4; 37, 9; 40, 6 (2); 44, 3. VII, 1, 1; 5, 3; 7, 5; 9, 6 (2); 11, 8; 12, 4; 13, 1; 20, 9 (2); 26, 1; 30, 1 (3); 31, 3; 31, 5; 35, 4; 35, 5; 38, 4; 45, 7; 50, 1; 50, 4; 51, 1; 51, 2; 60,

I; 60, 4; 61, 1; 62, 3; 62, 10; 65, 4 (2); 66, 1; 67, 5; 71, 5; 71, 7; 79, 1; 84, 1; 85, 6; 86, 4; 87, 2. Total, 122. C. I, 7, 1; 16, 6; 22, 1; 27, 3; 38, 1; 40, 1; 47, 6; 52, 7. II, 3, 1; 6, 4; 13, 2; 13, 3; 24, 4; 26, 1; 26, 5. III, 2, 1 (2); 3, 1 (2); 5, 1 (2); 7, 1; 24, 5; 28, 3 (2). IV, 6, 2; 12, 6; 15, 1; 16, 3; 21, 9; 23, 2; 23, 5; 25, 6; 26, 4; 32, 3; 37, 1. V, 1, 6; 2, 2; 9, 1; 15, 4; 17, 2; 18, 2; 22, 4; 31, 6; 32, 2; 36, 1; 37, 1; 47, 4; 54, 2 (2). VI, 1, 4; 3, 4; 44, 3. VII, 7, 4; 9, 5; 11, 1; 12, 3; 12, 6; 18, 1; 20, 1; 32, 2; 33, 3 (2); 40, 3; 44, 1; 48, 3; 54, 3; 55, 4 (2); 57, 4; 61, 1; 62, 6; 62, 8. Total, 74.

2. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 37, 2, *questum quod Harudes, qui nuper transportati essent, fines eorum popularentur*; to complain because the Harudes, who had recently been brought over, were ravaging their country.

A. II, 16, 2. III, 13, 1-4 (7); 14, 3. IV, 32, 5 (2). VI, 5, 4. Total, 12. B. I, 16, 3; 19, 2; 22, 3; 28, 5; 48, 5. II, 17, 4; 19, 3. III, 14, 3; 17, 2; 18, 6. IV, 12, 1 (2); 24, 4; 29, 2; 30, 1. V, 1, 1; 6, 2; 23, 4; 24, 7; 47, 2. VI, 35, 1; 40, 4. VII, 8, 3; 36, 3; 44, 3; 47, 2; 50, 2; 55, 10; 56, 2; 61, 2. Total, 30. C. I, 13, 5; 16, 6; 18, 8 (2); 31, 10; 34, 4; 37, 2; 40, 5; 42, 1; 44, 2; 52, 6 (2). II, 14, 3; 24, 2 (2). III, 9, 3; 17, 5. IV, 7, 3; 13, 3; 32, 1. V, 27, 7. VII, 20, 6; 33, 1. Total, 23.

3. The descriptive pluperfect following an imperfect of repeated action. Example: IV, 11, 2, *cum id non impetrassent petebant*, etc.; when they had failed to secure this they kept entreating, etc.

A. VI, 43, 3; 80, 3. Total, 2. B. IV, 16, 5 (3); 31, 2. VII, 80, 4; 81, 6. Total, 6. C. I, 16, 1. II, 15, 5 (2); 16, 1. III, 3, 2. IV, 11, 2. VII, 78, 4. Total, 7.

4. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive pluperfect and including the resulting situation as well as the act. Example: III, 22, 3, *eo interfecto cuius se amicitiae devovisset*; when the man had been killed to whose service he had bound himself.

A. IV, 29, 1. V, 6, 3; 18, 3. VII, 12, 2; 55, 2-3 (2). Total, 6. B. II, 8, 5; 26, 1. III, 23, 2. IV, 12, 6; 15, 5; 29, 2; 35, 1. V, 1, 9; 6, 1; 9, 4; 15, 3. VI, 3, 4; 35, 10. VII, 27, 1; 35, 3; 39, 1; 57, 1; 58, 4; 58, 6; 63, 3; 88, 1 (2). Total, 22. C. II, 23, 4. III, 22, 3. IV, 13, 5 (2). VI, 10, 4. VII, 18, 1. Total, 6.

5. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive pluperfect and including the act but not the resulting situation. Example: VII, 11, 8, *perpaucis desideratis quod pontis angustiae multitudinis fugam intercluserant*; having failed to capture very few, because the narrowness of the bridge had put a check to the flight of so great a number.

B. II, 24, 2. VII, 11, 8. Total, 2.

6. The descriptive pluperfect following an aoristic pluperfect and including the time of that pluperfect but not of its principal verb. Example: I, 12, 5; *hic pagus, cum domo exisset, L. Cassium interfecerat*; this canton, when it had left its home, had killed L. Cassius.

A. II, 27, 5. Total, 1. B. I, 29, 3. V, 54, 2. VII, 9, 1. Total, 3. C. I, 12, 5. IV, 27, 5. V, 22, 2. VII, 20, 4. Total, 4.

7. The descriptive pluperfect following an imperfect in result. Example: V, 39, 2, *accidit ut nonnulli milites, qui in silvas discessissent, interciperentur*; it happened that several soldiers, who had gone off into the woods, were caught.

B. V, 43, 5. Total, 1. C. V, 39, 2. VI, 41, 2. Total, 2.

8. The descriptive pluperfect following a past future and including both the time of the principal verb and that of the future event. Example: I, 13, 7, *ne committeret ut is locus ubi constitissent ex calamitate nomen caperet*; he should not let the place on which they were standing (had taken their stand) become famous from a disaster.

B. I, 5, 1; 7, 5; 24, 3; 28, 4. III, 1, 2; 8, 4. IV, 6, 5; 22, 5. V, 2, 3; 5, 4; 8, 3; 10, 1; 25, 4. VI, 5, 2. Total 14. C. I, 13, 7. II, 14, 5. III, 4, 1. IV, 11, 2; 16, 3. V, 4, 3; 38, 2; 52, 6. VII, 72, 2. Total 9.

9. The descriptive pluperfect following a past future and including the time of its principal verb but not that of the future event. Example: IV, 11, 1, *neque legatos audiendos arbitrabatur ab iis qui bellum intulissent*; he thought that envoys from those who had made war were not to be listened to.

C. II, 31, 5. IV, 7, 4; 11, 1. VI, 32, 2; 43, 3. Total, 5.

II. The pluperfect describing a situation which both began and ended at the same time as the action of its principal verb.

1. The pluperfect following a summarizing aorist. Example: V, 54, 3, *cum iussisset dicto audientes non fuerunt*; when he had given orders they did not obey.

B. I, 26, 3. II, 11, 2. Total, 2. C. V, 54, 3. Total, 1.

2. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: III, 20, 1, *cum in Aquitaniam pervenisset, diligentiam adhibendam intellegebat*; when he had reached Aquitania he was conscious that care was needed.

A. I, 33, 5. II, 19, 3. III, 2, 2. IV, 17, 1. Total, 4. B. I, 9, 3; 16, 3; 18, 10; 48, 5. II, 18, 1. IV, 31, 1 (2). V, 45, 2 (2); 48, 1; 50, 2. VI, 12, 6. VII, 46, 2; 61, 1. Total, 14. C. I, 32, 5. III, 20, 1. VII, 62, 4. Total, 3.

3. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: I, 31, 10, *sed peius Sequanis accidisse, quod in eorum finibus consedisset*; but a worse fate had befallen the Sequani because he had settled in their country.

A. V, 9, 4; 11, 9. Total, 2. B. III, 2, 3. Total, 1. C. I, 14, 7; 31, 10 (2). II, 4, 4. VII, 54, 4. Total 5.

4. The descriptive pluperfect following a summarizing aoristic pluperfect. Example: VII, 5, 4, *cum ad flumen venissent, paucos dies ibi morati domum revertuntur*; when they had reached the river, after stopping a few days they returned home.

C. VII, 5, 4; 20, 6. Total, 2.

III. The pluperfect describing a situation which lasted up to the time of its principal verb.

1. The descriptive pluperfect following an aorist. Example: V, 26, 3, *cum nostri arma cepissent hostes suos reduxerunt*; when our men had rushed to arms the enemy retreated.

A. IV, 27, 3 (2). V, 25, 2. Total, 3. B. I, 25, 6; 54, 1. II, 24, 4. III, 20, 4. IV, 38, 3. V, 17, 5; 53, 2; 58, 7. VI, 31, 5; 40, 7. VII, 3, 1; 42, 5; 48, 49, 1; 62, 8; 68, 1; 71, 8; 80, 9; 81, 4. Total, 19. C. V, 26, 3 (3). Total, 3.

2. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: VII, 50, 3, *Fabius quique una murum ascenderant praecipitabantur*; Fabius and those who had climbed the wall with him were thrown down.

B. VII, 50, 3. Total, 1.

3. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: III, 22, 4, *cum ad arma concurrissent, repulsus tamen impetravit*; when they had rushed to arms, he, though beaten back, yet obtained, etc.

A. III, 16, 2 (2). IV, 32, 4. Total, 3. B. VII, 46, 5. Total, 1. C. III, 22, 4 (2). V, 8, 6; 27; 2. Total, 4.

4. The descriptive pluperfect following an aoristic pluperfect. Example: II, 23, 3, *profligatis Viromanduis, quibuscum erant congressi*; having put to flight the Viromandui, whom they had encountered.

B. II, 23, 3. VII, 55, 5. Total, 2.

5. The descriptive pluperfect following an imperfect in result. Example: II, 27, 1, *tanta commutatio est facta ut nostri, etiam qui procubuissent, proelium redintegrarent*; such a change was effected that our men, even those who had fallen to the ground, renewed the battle.

C. II, 27, 1. Total, 1.

6. The descriptive pluperfect following a past future, its situation lasting up to the future event. Example: III, 8, 2, *se ob-sides quos Crasso dedissent recipituros existimabant*; they thought they should recover the hostages whom they had given to Crassus.

B. II, 20, 1. VII, 70, 5. Total, 2. C. III, 8, 2. Total, 1.

IV. The pluperfect describing a situation which began after the action or state of its principal verb began and stopped before it stopped.

1. The descriptive pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: II, 8, 2, *is collis ubi castra posita erant patebat*, etc.; the hill where the camp had been pitched stretched, etc.

A. II, 29, 3. Total, 1. B. II, 8, 2. Total, 1.

Totals for chapter, A, 79; B, 243; C, 150.

CHAPTER IV.

THE AORISTIC PLUPERFECT.

The aoristic pluperfect is divided into three large groups, according as the act is simply over and done with before the time of the principal verb, or is parallel with the action of that verb, or lasts up to the time of that verb. The last case may seem at first sight to be the same as the descriptive pluperfect which lasts up to the time of the principal verb; but this is not the case. "When they had built the wall the enemy destroyed it" is descriptive pluperfect, the result of the past act lasting up to the destruction; but "although he had been ill he recovered" is aoristic, the state not resulting from a past act.

I. The pluperfect of an act which simply preceded the act of its principal verb.

1. The aoristic pluperfect following an aorist. Example: I, 19, 4, *simul commonefacit quae sint dicta*; he told him what had been said.

A. I, 12, 5 (2). VI, 3, 5. VII, 39, 2. Total, 4. B. I, 3, 4 (2); 5, 4; 12, 6; 12, 7; 13, 2; 18, 2; 21, 3; 21, 4; 26, 1; 28, 1; 31, 1; 41, 4; 43, 9; 47, 2. II, 5, 4; 6, 4; 34. III, 23, 5; 29, 3. IV, 4, 3; 12, 4; 36, 2; 37, 1. VI, 11, 7; 20, 1; 27, 1; 35, 6; 37, 4. VII, 4, 1; 8, 8; 9, 3; 9, 6 (2); 37, 1; 41, 1; 42, 3; 44, 2. VIII, 4, 1 (2); 4, 4; 31, 4; 31, 5; 38, 4; 58, 2; 67, 7 (3); 78, 3; 81, 4. Total, 50. C. I, 19, 4 (2); 27, 2 (4); 41, 2; 43, 4; 46, 4 (3). IV, 15, 3; 25, 4; 23, 6; 26, 2 (2); 44, 4; 52, 3. VI, 37, 8. VII, 3, 3; 41, 2; 50, 4; 52, 1 (3); 53, 3; 54, 3. Total, 27.

2. The aoristic pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 14, 1, *eo gravius ferre quo minus merito accidissent*; he was the more angry about it as it had been done without provocation.

B. II, 1, 3; 19, 1; 20, 3; 24, 1; 35, 3. IV, 12, 1; 38, 2. V, 25, 1. VI, 9, 2. VII, 24, 2; 30, 2; 53, 1. Total, 12. C. I, 14, 1 (2); 17, 6; 19, 1 (3); 20, 2; 22, 2; 23, 3; 40, 6; 40, 7 (2); 42, 1; 42, 2; 42, 6; 44, 6 (3); 45, 3. II, 4, 2. III, 28, 1. IV, 8, 2. V, 27, 2 (2); 28, 4; 33, 2 (2). VII, 32, 4; 52, 2; 52, 3; 62, 2. Total, 31.

3. The aoristic pluperfect following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: II, 4, 4, quod quantam quisque multitudinem in concilio pollicitus sit cognoverint; because they had learned how large a number each had promised in the council.

A. VII, 76, 1. Total, 1. B. I, 13, 2; 15, 3. II, 7, 1; 12, 5 (2); 25, 2; 33, 3. III, 2, 1; 6, 2. IV, 12, 1; 19, 4; 29, 2. V, 4, 2; 5, 2; 25, 2; 41, 2; 57, 2; 58, 1. VI, 1, 4; 38, 1; 39, 4. VII, 9, 4; 47, 1; 49, 3; 58, 5; 68, 3. Total, 26. C. I, 29, 1; 30, 2; 31, 7. II, 4, 4; 14, 3. VII, 20, 1 (4). Total, 9.

4. The aoristic pluperfect following an aoristic pluperfect. Example: I, 22, 4, cognovit Considium quod non vidisset renuntiasset; he learned that Considius had reported a thing he had not seen.

B. V, 2, 3; 5, 2; 8, 6; 20, 1 (2); 54, 2. Total, 6. C. I, 22, 4; 40, 6. IV, 27, 5. VI, 31, 5; 42, 1. Total, 5.

5. The aoristic pluperfect following an imperfect in result. Example: V, 53, 1, incredibili celeritate fama perperitur, ut cum post horam nonam pervenisset, ante mediam noctem clamor oreretur; the news was carried so swiftly that, although he had arrived after the ninth hour, an outcry was made before midnight.

B. IV, 28, 2. Total, 1. C. V, 53, 1. Total, 1.

6. The aoristic pluperfect following a past future and preceding the time of its principal verb. Example: I, 13, 5, quod improvise unum pagum adortus esset ne ipsos despiceret; because he had caught one canton off its guard he must not despise them.

B. I, 3, 4; 28, 3, (2); 47, 4. IV, 35, 1. VII, 12, 3. Total, 6. C. I, 13, 5; 31, 14; 33, 4; 35, 4; 40, 9; 43, 8; 44, 5; 47, 1 (2). II, 32, 2. III, 3, 3; 20, 1 (2). IV, 13, 5; 22, 1. V, 7, 7. VI, 1, 2. VII, 1, 8; 17, 7; 38, 10; 47, 5; 53, 1. Total, 22.

II. The summarizing aoristic pluperfect of an act which both began and ended at the same time as the action of its principal verb.

1. The aoristic pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: VII, 83, 2, erat collis quem circumplecti non potuerant nostri; there was a hill which our men had not been able to enclose.

B. VII, 83, 2. Total, 1.

III. The summarizing aoristic pluperfect of an act which lasted up to the action of its principal verb.

1. The aoristic pluperfect following an aorist. Example: I, 26, 4, diu cum esset pugnatum castris potiti sunt; when they had fought for a long time they took the camp.

B. I, 17, 1. IV, 26, 5. Total, 2. C. I, 26, 4; 26, 5. III, 28, 3. IV, 3, 4. V, 4, 4; 23, 5. VI, 36, 1 (2). Total, 8.

2. The aoristic pluperfect following a descriptive imperfect. Example: I, 31, 8, *unum se esse qui adduci non potuerit*; he was the only one whom they had not been able to induce.

C. I, 31, 8; 36, 7; 43, 7 (2); 44, 4. VII, 20, 6. Total, 6.

3. The aoristic pluperfect following an imperfect of repeated action. Example: V, 33, 1, *tum Titurius, qui nihil ante provi. disset, trepidare*; then Titurius, who had made no preparations, kept running about.

C. V, 33, 1. Total, 1.

4. The aoristic pluperfect following a descriptive pluperfect. Example: III, 9, 3, *legatos, quod nomen inviolatum semper fuisset, in vincla coniectos*; they had thrown into chains envoys, a name which had always before been inviolate.

A. V, 11, 9. Total, 1. B. II, 26, 3. VII, 40, 1; 77, 1. Total, 3. C. III, 9, 3. V, 27, 2. Total, 2.

5. The aoristic pluperfect following an aoristic pluperfect. Example: I, 40, 8, *Ariovistum, cum multos menses castris se tenuisset, vicisse*; Ariovistus had conquered them after he had kept to his camp for many months.

C. I, 40, 8. Total, 1.

6. The aoristic pluperfect of an act lasting up to the future event of a past future. Example: VI, 7, 1, *Labienum cum una legione quae in eorum finibus hiemaverat adoriri parabant*; they were preparing to attack Labienus and the legion which had been wintering in their country.

B. VI, 7, 1. Total, 1.

7. The aoristic pluperfect of an act or state lasting up to the time of the principal verb of a past future. Example: VII, 33, 1, *ne civitas quam semper aluisset ad vim descenderet*; lest a state which he had always fostered should turn to violence.

B. VII, 59, 3; 64, 2. Total, 2. C. I, 14, 3 (2); 14, 6; 40, 13. VII, 14, 2; 33, 1 (2). Total, 7.

Total for the chapter, A, 6; B, 110; C, 120.

CHAPTER V.

THE PAST FUTURE AND FUTURE PERFECT.

While it is easy to distinguish in general the future and past future uses of the subjunctive from the other uses, a little examination shows that at least two or three varieties of future must be recognized in them; and it is not perfectly easy to make this subdivision. The classification here given is not entirely satisfactory

to me in detail, but a wider study of tense uses than can be made from Caesar or than I have yet been able to make in other authors is needed to settle all points; and the one given is sufficient for the purposes of this paper.

In the first place, it is to be noted that, as regards the original forces of the subjunctive, it is inaccurate to speak of the present as equivalent to the future indicative. The future indicative emphasizes the futurity of the act, simply stating that it will occur in the future, with very little regard to the present aspect of the case. The present periphrastic on the other hand emphasizes the presence of the expectation of a future act. The present subjunctive in all its original forces, with the possible exception of the anticipatory, is like the present periphrastic in tense force. Its original forces are all, or possibly only some of the following*:—let him go (volitive), he is likely to go (anticipatory), may he go (optative), he may go (potential), and he would go (ideal certainty). Probably in all of these the present originally expressed the present time of the feelings of will, expectation, etc., though the action of the verb lay in the future. The anticipatory subjunctive may at its very origin have been an exception, though in the great uncertainty which surrounds it one can not speak with much confidence. If, as seems probable, it is a pre-Latin development from the volitive, the process of development may have consisted just in this, that the present feeling of will died out and the emphasis shifted over to the futurity of the act. In that case the anticipatory subjunctive, as such, never did emphasize the present time of the feeling of expectation. However this may be, in classical Latin we find it always emphasizing the futurity of the act, while the other original forces retain the emphasis on the present quality of the feeling.

When any of these present subjunctives are thrown back into the past in the imperfect, this distinction in the tenses still holds in the main, and we have some constructions in which the imperfect signifies that a feeling of will, for example, lies in the past, the action willed being, of course, future to that time. This gives us a past future of one kind. In other constructions it emphasizes mainly the futurity of some act to a past point of reference. This gives us a past future of another kind.

In the same way the perfect and pluperfect subjunctive may be regarded as future perfect and future perfect to a past. Other

*This is the classification of meanings given by Professor Hale on pp 6 and 7 of *The Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin* (University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. I, 1895, preprinted in 1894).

writers use them to some extent in the former kind of future meaning, but Caesar does so almost never. When he does, the meaning of the verb is such that the pluperfect is really an imperfect. Imperfects and pluperfects representing in indirect discourse original futures and future perfects are futures of the second kind.

There is still another kind of past future, but it is a spurious one. It is the result of making some fixed idiom, as indirect question, substantive result, etc., dependent on a past future.

In this chapter the division according to time meanings has resulted in a division very largely according to syntactical constructions.

I. Constructions in which the past feeling is emphasized.

1. Final clauses of all kinds (except *quin* and *quominus*, for which see IV) and dependent deliberative questions.

As there are no indicative constructions to be compared with these, it has not seemed necessary to subdivide them. And as they are so easy of recognition that there could hardly be a dispute about the individual examples I give only the total number, omitting the references.

Total, 498 imperfects and presents equivalent to imperfects; 1 perfect equivalent to a pluperfect.

2. The subjunctive in indirect discourse representing an original imperative.

I, 7, 5; 13, 4; 13, 5 (2); 13, 7; 42, 4; 47, 1 (2). IV, 7, 4 (2); 11, 3; 11, 5; 16, 6. V, 34, 1; 34, 4; 41, 8 (2). VII, 66, 4. Total, 18.

3. The potential characterizing clause. These clauses are commonly explained as final; but see *Cum-Constructions*, pp. 106-107 (120-121 of German edition). Example: I, 28, 3, *domi nihil erat quo famem tolerarent*; they had nothing at home which they could eat.

I, 28, 3. III, 16, 3 (2). IV, 38, 2. VI, 39, 2. Total, 5.

4. The subjunctive of ideal certainty in result clauses. Example: VII, 19, 3, *ut, qui propinquitatem loci videret, existimaret*; with the result that whoever should look at their mere proximity would think.

VII, 19, 3 (2). Total, 2.

II. Constructions in which the idea of futurity is emphasized.

1. Clauses with *dum* and *quoad*, "until", and *priusquam* and *potius quam*.

These clauses must be treated together, since the principle underlying their use of mood and tense is the same. They differ from

the *postquam* clauses in that the subordinate acts given in them are subsequent to the action of their principal clauses, while those of the *postquam* clauses are precedent. It is true that after negative principal clauses the relation between the two acts is really reversed; but none the less the thought of the writer is engaged with the condition of things in the order indicated above.

Since these clauses represent the subordinate act as subsequent to the principal act, it is obvious that the actor of the principal clause may be thought of as looking forward to the subordinate act and preparing for it, preventing it, etc., or not. If the act is looked forward to, the anticipatory subjunctive is used; if not, the indicative (See Hale's Anticipatory Subjunctive, pp. 68-73, 84-92). This distinction usually holds good for the past tenses; though there was an encroachment of the subjunctive, appearing mainly in later Latin. But in the future the future tense may be used, and in the present and future the present indicative is sometimes used, as it regularly is in English. Accordingly, some of the indirect discourse examples which follow may represent original presents and futures indicative.

a. The past future of an anticipated act before which the action of the main clause occurred or was expected to occur (*dum*, etc., not possible*). Example: I, 19, 3, priusquam quicquam conaretur Divitiacum vocari iubet; before taking any steps he ordered Divitiacus to be summoned.

I, 19, 3. II, 12, 1. III, 10, 3; 26, 3. IV, 4, 7; 14, 1; 21, 1. V, 27, 9; 36, 5. VI, 3, 2; 4, 1; 5, 5; 34, 7. VII, 1, 6; 9, 5; 17, 7; 36, 7; 71, 1; 78, 1. Total, 19.

b. The past future perfect in the same use.

II, 32, 1. VII, 56, 1. Total, 2.

c. The past future of an anticipated act up to which the action of the principal clause lasted or was expected to last (both *dum*, etc., and *priusquam* are used†). Example: I, 7, 5, ut spatium intercedere posset dum milites convenirent; that sufficient time might intervene, until the soldiers should arrive.

I, 7, 5; 11, 6. IV, 13, 2; 23, 4. Total, 4.

d. The past future perfect in the same use.

III, 18, 7. IV, 11, 6; 12, 2. V, 24, 8; 58, 4. VII, 36, 1. Total, 6.

2. Subjunctives in indirect discourse representing original futures and future perfects indicative in conditions and relative clauses.

* There is no case in Caesar of the perfectly possible aorist indicative of a not anticipated act in this relation.

† For the aorist indicative of a not anticipated act in this relation see Chap. X, II, 2. For the aoristic pluperfect subjunctive in indirect discourse, representing such an aorist indicative, see Chap. IX, I, 2. For the present subjunctive of an anticipated act in the same relation see Chap. VIII, IV, 3.

Some of these probably represent subjunctives of the less vivid type of condition, but they could not usually be distinguished.

a. The imperfect representing an original future. Example: I, 8, 2, *quo facilius, si transire conarentur, prohibere possit*; that he might stop them if they should try to cross.

I, 8, 2; 8, 3; 10, 2, 13, 3; 13, 4; 14, 6 (2); 18, 9; 31, 4; 35, 4 (2); 36, 1; 36, 5; 36, 7; 40, 8; 40, 14; 42, 5; 44, 5 (2); 44, 8; 44, 11 (2); 44, 13. II, 6, 4; 8, 5; 9, 1; 9, 4; 17, 2; 31, 5. III, 1, 3; 2, 4 (2); 5, 2; 11, 2. IV, 7, 3; 8, 1; 11, 6; 13, 5; 16, 1; 19, 1; 20, 2. V, 3, 7; 5, 4; 7, 7 (2); 31, 2 (4); 46, 4; 48, 5; 50, 3 (2). VI, 33, 5; 34, 5; 34, 6. VII, 6, 3 (2); 9, 4; 10, 1 (2); 19, 2; 19, 3 (2); 19, 5; 28, 1; 32, 6; 33, 1; 36, 5; 56, 1; 66, 5 (3); 74, 1; 76, 5 (2); 78, 2 (2); 80, 1; 83, 5; 86, 2; 89, 2; 90, 2. In VII, 10, 1, *videret* stands for a future indicative in a causal *quod* clause, where a *cum* clause might have been expected. Total, 84.

b. Pluperfects representing original future perfects: Example: I, 13, 3, in *eam partem ituros ubi Caesar constituisset*; they would go wherever Caesar should have decided upon.

I, 13, 3 (2); 17, 4; 20, 4; 22, 3; 26, 6; 30, 3; 30, 5; 31, 2 (2); 31, 15; 33, 4; 35, 4; 36, 1 (2); 36, 5; 37, 4; 39, 7; 40, 4; 44, 12; 44, 13 (2); 50, 5. II, 5, 3 (2); 8, 4; 9, 5; 10, 4; 14, 5; 17, 2; 17, 4; 31, 3; 32, 1. III, 24, 3. IV, 6, 2; 11, 3; 17, 10; 20, 2 (3); 22, 1; 27, 1; 34, 5; 35, 1. V, 1, 8; 6, 6; 29, 1 (2); 34, 1; 40, 1; 41, 8; 47, 4; 56, 1; 58, 5. VI, 1, 3; 6, 3; 32, 2; 40, 2. VII, 5, 5; 17, 6; 20, 11; 21, 3; 27, 2; 34, 1; 39, 4; 44, 4; 49, 2; 60, 1; 61, 5; 66, 7; 71, 3; 71, 6; 85, 3 (2). Total, 74.

3. The anticipatory subjunctive in indirect questions (See Hale's *Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin*, p. 34). Example: II, 9, 1, *si nostri transirent hostes expectabant*; the enemy kept waiting to see if we would cross.

I, 8, 4. II, 9, 1. III, 24, 1. VI, 29, 4; 37, 4; 39, 2. VII, 20, 10; 32, 2; 36, 3; 55, 9; 89, 5. With some hesitation I include here VII, 14, 7 (2). Total, 13.

4. The volitive subjunctive in other dependent relations, equivalent in tense force to II, 2, of this chapter.

III, 9, 6. VII, 64, 3 (2). Total, 3

III. The spurious past future.

1. Indirect questions. Example: I, 20, 6, *custodes ponit ut quae agat scire possit*; he set guards over him that he might know what he did.

I, 20, 6 (2); 47, 5. V, 8, 1. Total, 4.

2. Characterizing clauses. Example: V, 36, 2, *sperare impetrari posse quod ad salutem pertineat*; he hoped some terms could be secured which would secure safety.

V, 36, 2. VII, 29, 6. Total, 2.

3. Substantive result clauses. Example: I, 20, 4, *futurum uti totius Galliae animi a se averterentur*; the result would be that all Gaul would turn against him.

I, 4, 1; 10, 2; 20, 4; 31, 11 (2); 31, 14 (3); 42, 3. II, 17, 3. IV, 35, 1. VII, 32, 6. Total, 12.

IV. The past future in *quin* and *quominus* clauses.

I regret to confess that I neither know of an entirely satisfactory treatment or classification of these clauses nor can make one for myself. In this uncertainty I prefer to give all the *quin* and *quominus* clauses in two general groups rather than to attempt a further subdivision. I believe that the group here given includes examples of all three of the preceding larger subdivisions of this chapter. For the rest of these clauses see Chap. VI, 5.

I, 31, 7; 31, 15; 33, 4 (2); 47, 2. II, 2, 4 (2). III, 18, 4 (2); 23, 7; 24, 5. IV, 7, 3; 22, 4. V, 2, 2. VII, 38, 8; 44, 4; 49, 2; 66, 6. Total, 18.

Total for the chapter, C, 765.

CHAPTER VI.

SOME DEVELOPED SUBJUNCTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS.

In this chapter are given those subjunctive constructions which are derived from the future uses of the subjunctive, but in which the tense meanings are not equivalent to those of the corresponding tenses of the indicative.

1. The breakdown of the *priusquam* clause (See Hale's Anticipatory Subjunctive, p. 87)*.

In later Latin than Caesar's it is not unusual for a subjunctive to be used where an earlier writer would have used the indicative. This is an extension of the past future construction, and the tenses are retained. Caesar has one clear case of this, VII, 82, 4. Another in which it may be possible to see some anticipatory feeling is VI, 37, 2. Another which may be due to attraction is VI, 30, 2. Total, 3.

2. The independent question of propriety in indirect discourse. Example: I, 40, 2, *cur quisquam iudicaret?* Why should any one suppose.

I, 40, 2; 40, 4 (2). IV, 16, 4. VII, 37, 5. Total, 5.

3. Result clauses. Professor Hale's explanation of these clauses has already been referred to in Chap. II. I accept it in general though the exact parallelism between the clauses of result and characterizing clauses, which he assumes, can not be regarded as definitely proved, because the former appears fully developed in Plautus, while the latter does not.

The result clause is a peculiar idiom standing to a certain extent alone in its tense meanings. Our nearest approach to its true feel-

*The similar breakdown in the *dum* clause does appear in Caesar.

ing is "such, etc., as to"; it might therefore have been better to give all the examples by themselves. But in most cases the time meaning is found to be parallel with one or another of the subordinate indicative tense meanings, and those examples have been given already, appearing under most of the subdivisions of the preceding chapters. There remain to be given here those cases in which the imperfect has an aoristic force. If it depends upon an aorist or imperfect as in most of the following examples, it is equivalent in meaning to an aorist; if upon a pluperfect, it is sometimes equivalent to an aoristic pluperfect. Example: I, 39, 1, *tantus timor exercitum occupavit ut mentes perturbaret*; such fear siezed upon the army that it dismayed all.

I, 20, 5; 25, 4; 31, 4; 39, 1; 52, 3; 52, 5 (3). II, 11, 1; 19, 7; 27, 1; 35, 1. III, 4, 1; 19, 3 (2); 22, 3. IV, 12, 2; 28, 2 (3). V, 17, 2; 18, 5 (2); 23, 3-4 (3); 33, 6 (2); 39, 2; 40, 7; 43, 4 (3); 43, 5 (2); 44, 1-3 (2); 51, 3; 51, 4; 53, 1; 53, 7. VI, 12, 4 (5); 17, 5; 30, 2 (2); 37, 2; 38, 5 (2); 41, 2; 41, 3 (2); 43, 4 (2); 43, 5 (4). VII, 17, 5 (2); 24, 5 (4); 28, 6; 29, 4; 46, 5; 76, 1 (2). In I, 13, 2, the *transirent* clause is simply a timeless substantive. In the two following the perfect stands in indirect discourse for an original true perfect, not aorist. I, 11, 3. II, 3, 5. Total, 75.

4. Conditions contrary to fact.

a. The imperfect in present conditions contrary to fact.

I, 34, 2. V, 29, 2. VII, 77, 6; 77, 13. Total, 4.

b. The imperfect in conditions contrary to fact where a pluperfect would be expected.

VII, 46, 1. Total, 1.

c. The pluperfect in past conditions contrary to fact.

I, 14, 2. VII, 88, 6. Total, 2.

5. *Quin* and *quominus* clauses (See Chap. V, IV)*.

I, 3, 6; 17, 4. V, 53, 5; 55, 1 (4). VI, 39, 3. VII, 11, 8; 36, 4. Total, 10.
Total for the chapter, C, 100.

CHAPTER VII.

TENSES OF REPEATED ACTION DEPENDING ON SIMILAR TENSES.

In the examples here included a clause containing a tense of repeated action depends on another in such a way that each act of the subordinate verb is a condition, result, purpose, &c., of an act of the principal verb. They are thus quite different from the tenses of repeated action given in other chapters, where a series of acts is related to a single act, or is as a whole related to another series without each act's being related to a single one of the other

*The only other *quin* clause in Caesar will be found under Chap. VII.

series. Except in conditional clauses this relation is of little importance, and is hard to distinguish from the single act. Some that might have been put here have been left under the corresponding categories of single acts. The conditional sentences showing this relation are probably all here.

1. The imperfect of repeated action depending on the imperfect of repeated action. Example: VII, 17, 4, *Cæsar cum singulas legiones appellaret, petebant, &c.*; when Cæsar addressed the legions one by one, they would beg him, &c.

A. VII, 67, 4 (2). Total 2. B. I, 39, 6; 48, 6; 48, 7. II, 1, 4; 20, 4. III, 4, 2. V, 40, 6; 45, 1. VI, 12, 7; 19, 5. VII, 4, 3; 67, 4. Total 12. C. I, 14, 5; 17, 5; 32, 4; 50, 4. II, 20, 1; 27, 4. III, 13, 5 (2); 14, 7. IV, 7, 3; 17, 7. V, 33, 6; 35, 4. VI, 15, 1 (2). VII, 14, 6; 16, 2 (2); 16, 3 (2); 17, 4 (2); 73, 6. Total 23.

2. The imperfect of repeated action following a pluperfect of repeated action. Example: IV, 17, 4; *haec cum defixerat ut secundum naturam fluminis procumberent*; when he had set each pair in such a way that it sloped down-stream.

B. IV, 17, 6. VI, 34, 2. Total 2. C. IV, 17, 4. Total 1.

3. The pluperfect of repeated action following an imperfect of repeated action. Example: I, 25, 3; *cum ferrum se inflexisset, non evellere poterant*; when the point had bent they could not pull it out.

B. I, 48, 6. II, 11, 4. III, 4, 4; 12, 2; 14, 6 (2); 15, 1; 29, 1. IV, 17, 4 (2); 26, 1; 26, 2; 26, 4. V, 19, 1; 19, 2; 34, 2; 35, 1 (2); 35, 3 (3). VI, 43, 2. VII, 22, 2; 22, 4; 28, 6; 48, 2; 73, 4; 81, 6; 84, 2. Total 29. C. I, 25, 3; 31, 12. II, 14, 5; 27, 3. III, 12, 1; 13, 7 (2). V, 16, 2. Total 8.

4. The pluperfect of repeated action following a pluperfect of repeated action. Example: V, 35, 3; *cum in eum locum unde erant egressi reverti coeperant*; whenever they had begun to retreat to the place from which they had started.

B. II, 7, 3. V, 35, 3. Total 2.

5. The repeated past future following a repeated imperfect. Example: IV, 16, 1; *cum videret Germanos tam facile impelli ut in Galliam venirent*; since he saw that the Germans were so easily induced to enter Gaul.

C. IV, 16, 1. Total 1.

6. The past future perfect of repeated action following a past future of repeated action. Example: V, 34, 3; *Pronuntiari iubet quam in partem Romani impetum fecerint cedant*; he commanded that in whatever direction the Romans should advance, they should retire.

C. V, 34, 3. Total 1.

Total for the chapter, A, 2; B, 45; C, 34.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRESENTS, PERFECTS, AND FUTURES.

These tenses correspond for the present time-sphere to the imperfect and pluperfect in the past time-sphere. Accordingly it has not seemed necessary to give a special heading and example for each category. A reference is made in each case to the corresponding category for the past time-sphere, where the headings and examples will serve *mutatis mutandis* for the divisions of this chapter.

Though there is theoretically an aoristic present bearing the same relation to the descriptive present as the aorist bears to the imperfect, it is difficult, if not impossible, to classify the examples satisfactorily on this basis, and all presents have been called descriptive. The true perfect corresponds exactly to the descriptive pluperfect, aorist to the aoristic pluperfect, the present subjunctive in the future sense to the past future, &c.

I. The descriptive present and present of repeated action.

1. Cf. Chap. II, I, 3. A. VI, 35, 9 (2). Total 2. B. VI, 35, 8. VII, 77, 16. Total 2. C. V, 54, 5. VI, 11, 1. VII, 38, 7 (2). Total 4.
2. Cf. Chap. II, I, 6. C. IV, 5, 3 (2). Total 2.
3. Cf. Chap. II, I, 7. C. VI, 25, 4. Total 1.
4. Cf. Chap. II, I, 14. A. VI, 8, 3 (2). VII, 38, 3. Total 3. B. VII, 38, 8; 50, 6; 77, 3; 77, 4; 77, 11; 77, 16 (2). Total 7.
5. Like 4, but with present of repeated action: B. VI, 22, 3. Total 1.
6. Cf. Chap. II, I, 17. A. VII, 50, 6. Total 1. B. IV, 25, 3. V, 30, 1. VII, 50, 4. Total 3.
7. Cf. Chap. II, II, 3. B. I, 1, 1; 1, 3 (3); 1, 7; 2, 3 (3); 4, 4; 10, 1; 12, 1; 16, 5; 38, 5 (2). III, 8, 1 (3); 21, 3. IV, 2, 6; 3, 3; 10, 1; 10, 3; 10, 5 (2); 20, 1. V, 11, 8; 12, 1; 13, 1; 13, 2 (2); 13, 3; 13, 5; 14, 1 (2). VI, 11, 3; 13, 1; 18, 3; 20, 1; 20, 2 (2); 24, 4-6 (3); 26, 1; 27, 1; 28, 1. VII, 20, 12 (2); 23, 5; 50, 6; 75, 4. Total 51. C. I, 12, 1 (2); 38, 5. IV, 1, 9; 2, 1; 14, 3. VI, 25, 4; 25, 5 (2); 35, 9 (2). Total, 11.
8. Cf. Chap. II, II, 4. B. I, 1, 3. IV, 2, 2. V, 14, 2. VI, 13, 10; 16, 3. VII, 23, 5. Total, 6.
9. Cf. Chap. II, II, 5. A. II, 6, 2 (2). VII, 23, 1-5 (8). Total, 10. B. I, 1, 3 (2); 1, 4; 16, 5. IV, 3, 3. V, 13, 1. VI, 18, 3; 21, 5 (2); 30, 5. VII, 23, 5. Total, 11. C. III, 22, 2 (3). IV, 5, 2 (4). VI, 11, 3. Total, 8.
10. Cf. Chap. II, II, 6. B. IV, 2, 2 (2). Total, 2.
11. Cf. Chap. II, II, 8. B. III, 8, 1. IV, 10, 1. V, 12, 2. Total, 3. C. VI, 14, 4. Total, 1.
12. The descriptive present extending from the time of a principal verb to that of the future event of a future. B. VI, 14, 4. VII, 5, 6. Total, 2.

II. The descriptive perfect.

1. Cf. Chap. III, I, 2. A. VI, 35, 9. VII, 38, 2 (2). Total, 3. B. VII, 38, 3. Total, 1.

2. Cf. Chap. III, I, 8. B. VII, 38, 8 (2); 77, 7; 77, 9. Total, 4.
3. Cf. Chap. III, II, 2. B. III, 8, 1 (2). IV, 3, 3. V, 12; 2 (4). VI, 11, 1; 26, 1. VII, 57, 1; 77, 10. Here probably belongs also IV, 10, 4. Total, 12. C. VI, 25, 4; 25, 5. Total, 2.
4. Like 3, but following a present of repeated action. C. IV, 33, 3. Total, 1.
5. The situation of a perfect lasting up to the future event of a future. B. VII, 50, 4; 77, 15. Total, 2.

III. The aorist following a tense of the present time-sphere.

1. Cf. Chap. IV, I. B. IV, 3, 3. VII, 77, 12. Total, 2. C. I, 4, 4. VI, 31, 1. VII, 5, 6. Total, 3.
2. Cf. Chap. IV, III. B. VI, 8, 3; 8, 4; 20, 2. Total, 3.

IV. Futures of all kinds.

1. Cf. Chap. V, I, 1. IV, 2, 1 (2); 33, 2. VI, 13, 7; 20, 1 (3); 22, 3 (6); 23, 4 (2); 28, 3. VII, 20, 8; 20, 12; 77, 5 (2). Total, 20.
2. Cf. Chap. V, I, 2. VI, 23, 7. Total, 1.
3. Cf. Chap. V, II, 1, c. VII, 23, 4. Total, 1.
4. Cf. Chap. V, II, 2, a. IV, 33, 2. V, 30, 3. VI, 22, 4. VII, 77, 8. Total, 4.
5. Cf. Chap. V, II, 2, b. B. (The indicative may appear here, though it could not in the past). V, 30, 2. Total, 1. C. IV, 2, 1. VI, 17, 3; 20, 1. Total, 3.

V. Corresponding to Chap. VII.

1. Cf. Chap. VII, 1. B. III, 18, 6. IV, 2, 3; 5, 3. V, 33, 1. VI, 13, 2; 13, 5; 13, 9 (2); 13, 10, 13, 11; 15, 1; 15, 2; 16, 2; 19, 4; 23, 4 (2); 23, 6; 23, 7. VII, 21, 1; 84, 5. Total, 20. C. III, 22, 2. IV, 2, 2. VI, 14, 4; 16, 3; 18, 2; 27, 4. VII, 23, 3 (3). Total, 9.
2. Cf. Chap. VII, 2. C. VI, 18, 3. Total, 1.
3. The present of repeated action following a future of repeated action. C. IV, 5, 2. VI, 23, 7. Total, 2.
4. Cf. Chap. VII, 3. B. II, 6, 2 (2). IV, 1, 5; 2, 2; 33, 1. V, 14, 5 (2); 21, 3. VI, 13, 5 (2); 13, 6; 13, 7; 16, 2; 16, 5; 17, 3 (2); 18, 3; 19, 1; 19, 2; 19, 3 (2); 20, 3 (2); 21, 4; 22, 2 (2); 23, 7; 23, 8; 23, 9; 27, 2; 27, 4; 27, 5; 28, 2; 28, 3. I include the following though the form may be present. V, 56, 2. VI, 15, 1; 19, 3. VII, 3, 2. Total, 38. C. III, 22, 2. IV, 5, 2 (2). VI, 16, 5. Total, 4.
5. Cf. Chap. VII, 4. B. V, 21, 3. Total, 1. C. VI, 27, 4. Total, 1.
6. The perfect of repeated action following a future of repeated action. C. IV, 5, 2. Total, 1.
7. I am in doubt as to whether VII, 11, 4, *faciat* is to be regarded as a "mixed" condition, in which case it is a sort of future; or as the so-called subjunctive of repeated action, in which case it belongs under 1. I incline toward the latter view, although this subjunctive is rare in Caesar, and rare in the present at all periods. Total, 1.

VI. Miscellaneous.

1. A present following a present in a "balancing clause" (See Chap. X, II, 7). B. III, 19, 7. Total, 1.
2. A present following a present in the relation of "coincidence" (See Chap. X, II, 4). B. I, 1, 4 (2). II, 17, 4. Total, 3.
3. A construction which I find difficulty in properly classifying, but which I prefer to call a "potential determination" is, C, V, 30, 2. Total, 1.

Totals for the chapter, A, 19; B, 176; C, 82.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REMAINING TENSES IN SEQUENCE.

In this chapter are given all the indicative and subjunctive tenses in sequence which have not been given under the previous chapters. It includes therefore a very miscellaneous assortment of examples. I give at the end a summing up of the results so far reached.

I. Tenses whose lack of logical sequence is disguised by indirect discourse.

So far as Caesar is concerned, I feel safe in saying that the flattening out of logical distinctions in indirect questions and indirect discourse consists in a mere disguise of the lack of sequence in the original language, the resulting tense being always used strictly in accordance with its proper meaning. It is true that *repraesentatio* occasionally retains the exceptional tense, and examples of this will be noted in the following chapter; but *repraesentatio* is so common that it takes a very close examination to show when the tense is the representative of a non-sequent tense, and it seems fair to speak of even those cases as disguised. Beyond a doubt, more than this disguising takes place in other authors in these constructions. A perfect after a present may, though seldom, represent an imperfect in an indirect question, and there is then a true flattening out of tense distinctions. But I find no instance of this or any similar phenomenon in the Gallic War.

The disguising of tense distinctions by indirect discourse is, however, common enough, and results from two causes. First, the tenses of the subjunctive, being fewer in number than those of the indicative which they have to represent, have more work to perform than in the direct form, and the distinctions of tense are not so readily seen. But since the resulting tenses are nevertheless used in strict accordance with their proper meanings, the examples do not fall under this head but under one or another of the preceding chapters.

Second, in direct discourse the tenses for the most part belong to the ordinary past, present, and future time-spheres, for which there is a fair, though not complete, complement of tenses. By indirect discourse they are thrown back a step, so that we have an ante-past time-sphere, if I may so speak, a past time-sphere, and a past future time-sphere. This ante-past time-sphere has already been spoken of in Chap. II, and it has been shown that the subjunctives not in indirect discourse occasionally suffer in clearness from the lack of tenses to represent it. It works more trouble in

indirect discourse, because every past of the direct form is thrown back into it, and this happens very frequently. It is true that as most tenses in the direct form are in sequence, so they are still logically as well as formally in sequence in the indirect. But wherever the direct form had a present depending on a past, the indirect imperfect is logically out of sequence with the perfect infinitive or pluperfect on which it depends, though formally in sequence. And wherever the direct form had an aorist depending on a past, the indirect pluperfect is logically out of sequence with the past infinitive or pluperfect on which it depends, though formally in sequence.

No sure instance of the disguised present following a past has been found. In the direct form this relation occurs almost entirely where the present states a general truth or describes something still existing. But an imperfect is used with equal frequency in these cases in direct discourse. Therefore it is impossible to say of any given indirect imperfect whether it represents an original present or an imperfect, though *repraesentatio* might help one to a few examples. All the examples under this heading are of aorists.

1. The pluperfect or perfect subjunctive for an aorist indicative with *postquam* (See Chap. X, II, 1).

I, 31, 5. IV, 19, 2. VI, 10, 4. With *ut* meaning "ever since," I, 31, 5. Total, 4.

2. The pluperfect subjunctive for an aorist indicative with *prinsquam* (See Chap. X, II, 2).

I, 43, 7. Total, 1.

3. The perfect subjunctive for an aorist indicative with *quam diu* in "congruence" (See Chap. X, II, 6).

I, 17, 6. Total, 1.

4. The pluperfect or perfect subjunctive for the aorist indicative in "coincidence" (See Chap. X, II, 4).

I, 18, 10; 30, 2; 31, 12; 35, 2. V, 27, 3; 27, 4. VII, 20, 3 (2); 52, 3. Total, 9.

5. The pluperfect or perfect subjunctive for the aorist indicative following an aorist (See Chap. X, III, 4).

I, 36, 3 (3); 40, 12; 44, 9. II, 4, 7. III, 28, 2. VI, 42, 2. VII, 29, 2; 41, 1. Total, 10.

6. The perfect subjunctive by *repraesentatio* for an aorist subjunctive in result (See Chap. X, I, 1).

VII, 37, 4. Total, 1.

7. The perfect subjunctive by *repraesentatio* for an aorist subjunctive in concessive clause (See Chap. X, I, 2).

VI, 25, 4. Total, 1.

8. The perfect subjunctive by *repraesentatio* for an aorist indicative in conclusions.

VII, 33, 3. Total, 1.

II. Idioms in which the subordinate clause is regularly of the same tense as the principal clause.

In these idioms, when the principal verb is an aorist the subordinate verb is out of sequence and will be given in Chap. X, II; but when it is any other tense, the subordinate clause is in sequence.

1. "Coincidence" (See Chap. X, II, 4).

a. The imperfect or present subjunctive in indirect discourse for a present indicative.

I, 36, 6; 40, 12; 44, 6; 44, 9; 44, 10. V, 27, 11 (2). Total, 7.

b. The perfect subjunctive in indirect discourse for an aorist indicative.

I, 17, 6. Total, 1.

c. The imperfect subjunctive where the relation seems to be that of coincidence, but the mood of the *cum* clause seems to disregard it (the indicative being regular in such clauses).

II, 29, 5 (2). V, 54, 1. Total, 3.

2. "Pseudo-coincidence" (See Chap. X, II, 5).

a. The imperfect indicative following an imperfect.

V, 19, 3; 57, 4. VI, 34, 7. VII, 16, 3. Total, 4.

b. The past future subjunctive following a past future.

I, 35; 4. III, 11, 5. IV, 21, 8. V, 1, 1; 7, 1; 11, 4. VII, 8, 3; 35, 5. Total, 8.

3. The imperfect indicative in "congruence" (See Chap. X, II, 6).

VII, 81, 2. Total, 1.

4. The past future subjunctive following a descriptive imperfect in a "balancing clause" (See Chap. X, II, 7).

I, 44, 8. Total, 1.

III. Clauses which are properly out of sequence, but by happening to depend on presents are formally in sequence.

Caesar's frequent "*ut dictum est*," etc., is probably a perfect; but whether perfect or aorist it is out of sequence with a past verb. Sometimes, however, it depends on a present and then is, so far as form goes, in sequence (See Chap. X, III 1).

I, 1, 5. III, 20, 1. V, 3, 1. VI, 25, 1; 29, 1. VII, 23, 2; 58, 3. Total, 7.

IV. True sequence feeling triumphing over an idiom.

As Caesar has no idioms in the subjunctive which regularly violate sequence, none but indicatives are found here; and they are all in the *postquam*, etc., aorist idiom (See Chap. X, II, 1). Few good cases occur even here. In VII, 87, 3, the imperfect appears with *postquam*, the meaning calling for that tense. The few imperfects and pluperfects with *ubi* are, I believe, all generalizing and have been classified in the appropriate subdivisions of Chap. VII.

A relative clause is used four times with a meaning exactly equivalent to this idiom; but as the form is not the same the tense yields to the idiom only twice (See Chapter X, II, 1, *d.*), and the other two examples use the natural tenses.

III, 23, 2. IV, 18, 1. Total, 3.

V Formal sequence observed where the sense might lead one to expect an exception.

1. It may be mentioned here that in a number of cases, which have been classified elsewhere, the imperfect of such a verb as *dicere* has been used where the tense would strictly be appropriate only if such a verb as *existimare* had been used, and the aorist might have been more accurate since *dicere* was chosen. Examples: (Indicative) VII, 75, 5, numerum non compleverunt quod dicebant, etc.; they did not fill up their quota because they said, etc., (because, as they said, etc., or, because they felt, etc.). (Subjunctive) V, 6, 3, Partim quod timeret, partim quod diceret.

2. Instead of the "*ut dictum est*", etc., (See Chapter X, III, 1) which seems to give the appropriate tense meaning, Caesar occasionally uses a pluperfect. On this use of the tense see Blase, *Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts*, pp. 13 ff.

II, 1, 1; 24, 1; 28, 1. IV, 57, 2. Total, 4.

3. A few doubtful cases may be mentioned for the subjunctive.

I, 50, 4, cum quaereret quam ob rem Ariovistus proelio non decertaret; when he asked why Ariovistus did not fight. But this is equivalent to such "persistent" imperfects indicative as I, 15, 4, Caesar suos a proelio continebat; Caesar kept restraining his men. II, 27, 5, non ut deberet; so it ought not to be thought. A present would have been appropriate enough here. but the writer's thought is busy with the past time. V, 10, 2, qui nuntiarent naves in litore eiectas esse quod neque ancorae subsisterent; to report that the ships had been driven upon the shore because the anchors did not hold. But here the pluperfect would seem more appropriate than the possible aorist. Probably it represents a kind of imperfect of repeated action, "because the anchors kept giving." V, 11, 8, eo cum venisset maiores copiae convenerant; when he arrived greater forces had assembled. One might possibly expect a cum venit as in VI, 12, 1, (See Chap. X, II, 9.) but the common narrative clause is used instead. Total, 4.

VI. Tenses in sequence used peculiarly for others which would also have been in sequence.

1. The imperfect where a pluperfect would have seemed more natural.

B. The first three indicatives put here are all due to an expression of time in the clause, as in the independent imperfect for aorist in VII, 24, 3, *eodem tempore eruptio fiebat*; at the same time a sally was made (was going on). VII, 44, 1; 48, 3; 59, 2; 69, 6. Total, 4. C. In the two following subjunctives I see no good reason for the imperfect. II, 23, 3. VII, 33, 3. In I, 50, 4; II, 4, 1; 15, 3, *cum quaereret reperiebat*, we have the common imperfect in verbs of asking. In I, 41, 5, *septimo die, cum iter non intermitterent, certiora factus est*, we might expect a pluperfect; but the feeling may be "he marched for seven days, not interrupting his advance." Total 6.

2. The pluperfect where an imperfect would have seemed more natural.

II, 6, 4, *Iccius, qui tum praefuerat, mittit*; Iccius, who was in command, sent. But the *tum* seems to point to the time of the preceding assault. Total, 1.

3. The imperfect where an imperfect periphrastic would have seemed more natural.

VII, 26, 2, *Id sese effecturos sperabant, quod palus Romanos tardabat*; was sure to hinder the Romans. Total, 1.

VII. Miscellaneous.

1. Subjunctive questions in indirect discourse (not questions of propriety).

I, 44, 8 (2); 47, 6. II, 30, 4. V, 29, 5. Total, 5.

2. Aoristic pluperfect indicative depending syntactically on a pluperfect, but temporally on the principal verb.

II, 33, 2. III, 3, 1; 16, 2. IV, 6, 2. V, 8, 6; 20, 1. Total, 6.

3. I cannot satisfy myself as to either mood or tense force of VII, 72, 4, *Turres circumdedit quae distarent*. The subjunctive may possibly be characterizing, or perhaps merely parallel with the preceding *tardarent*, almost attraction. Total, 1.

Total for the chapter, B, 31; C, 64.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS SO FAR OBTAINED.

We have now finished with all tenses which are in sequence, except those in coordinate relative clauses. We have found 940 dependent indicatives and 1861 subjunctives in sequence. There remain for consideration in the following chapter only the exceptions in both moods. Of these there will be found 282 dependent indicatives and 13 subjunctives. Many of these will be found to appear in certain well defined idioms; so that we may say at once that most of the tenses in both moods are in sequence, though the proportion of exceptions is very much greater in the indicative than in the subjunctive. There have been given also 371 independent

indicatives which can fairly be said to be in sequence. As I have made no count of the great number of independent indicatives which are out of sequence the exact number of those in sequence is of little consequence. I regard the examples themselves, however, as very important, by way of showing how the same feeling operates in independent sentences as in dependent clauses.

I hope I may be believed to have shown that all the examples of the subjunctive so far given are in sequence not because of any more mechanical flattening out of logical distinctions than is to be found in the indicative, but that almost all the tenses are used in strict conformity with the tense meanings as laid down in Chap. I, and that in the very small minority the subjunctive shows no more divergence than does the indicative. I therefore regard Professor Hale's main contention as fully proved. The few exceptions to be noted in the following chapter will only confirm the theory that the tenses of the subjunctive are fully expressive of time.

CHAPTER X.

EXCEPTIONS TO SEQUENCE.

I. Exceptions in the subjunctive.

1. In result clauses.

a. The aorist subjunctive instead of an imperfect. It has already been noticed (See Chap. VI, 3.) that the imperfect in result clauses often comes very near, or is exactly equivalent in tense force to, an aorist. The surprising thing is not that there are exceptions to sequence in this idiom, but that there are so few.

II, 21, 5. III, 15, 4. V, 15, 1 (2); 54, 4. VII, 17, 3, (note here the following *sustentarent* with equivalent tense force). Total, 6.

b. The imperfect following a true perfect.

IV, 1, 10, in *eam se consuetudinem adduxerunt ut haberent et lavarentur*; they have brought themselves to such a habit that they have, etc., and bathe, etc. Both sense and sequence here call for a present, but the habit of using an imperfect after a perfect form is too strong. The case is quite different in III, 22, 3, and VI, 17, 1; for although our translation for the principal verb of these sentences would be "have", they are not perfects but aorists, and the following imperfects are regular. Total, 2.

2. The aorist following an aorist in concessive *cum* clause,

I, 26, 2. Total, 1.

3. The past future following a true perfect.

VI, 11, 4. Total, 1.

4. The present of a general truth following a past in indirect question.

VI, 35, 2 (2). Total, 2.

5. The list of exceptions in the subjunctive might have been swelled by counting the cases in which *repraesentatio* in indirect discourse retains the exception. One in result and one in a concessive *cum* clause will be found under Chap. IX, I. But *repraesentatio* is so common in indirect discourse that it seemed fair to speak of these cases as "disguised." Yet I give here one case of an aorist subjunctive attracted from an aorist indicative causal *quod* clause.

VI, 31, 1. Total, 1.

Total for the section, 13.*

II. Tense idioms which bring about exceptions in the indicative. A large number of indicatives will be found to fall under one or another of these fixed idioms.

1. The aorist with *postquam*, *simul atque*, *ubi*.

a. Following an aorist. It is worth noting how strong the preference seems to be for confining the use of this construction to this situation.

I, 5, 2; 7, 3; 8, 3; 24, 1; 27, 3; 28, 1; 43, 4; 46, 4; 49, 1; 50, 2. II, 5, 4; 8, 2; 9, 2; 19, 6; 25, 1; 31, 1. III, 14, 1; 14, 2; 15, 2; 18, 3; 18, 5; 21, 3; 23, 7; 23, 8. IV, 19, 4; 25, 1; 26, 5; 27, 1; 28, 1; 37, 4. V, 3, 3; 3, 5; 6, 4; 9, 1; 56, 1; 58, 3. VI, 8, 6; 9, 1; 29, 1. VII, 3, 1; 12, 1; 12, 5; 26, 4; 28, 2; 51, 3. Total, 45.

b. Following a perfect participle (Compare remark on 5).

I, 12, 2; 16, 5. II, 10, 4. IV, 12, 1. V, 32, 1. VII, 58, 2. Total, 6.

c. Following other past forms.

II, 30, 3. VII, 82, 1. Total, 2.

d. In a relative clause equivalent in meaning to a *postquam* clause (See Chap. IX, IV.).

IV, 18, 4. V, 26, 1. Total, 2.

2. *Priusquam* with aorist indicative.

I, 53, 1. V, 17, 3-4 (2). VII, 25, 4; 47, 3. Total, 5.

3. *Dum* with the present indicative. This construction also is almost entirely confined to situations where it can follow an aorist.

a. Following an aorist.

I, 27, 4; 39, 1; 46, 1. III, 17, 1. IV, 22, 1; 32, 1; 34, 3. V, 22, 1; 35, 7; 37, 2; 44, 11. VI, 37, 1; 42, 1; 57, 1; 66, 1; 75, 1. Total, 16.

b. Following a perfect participle (Compare remark on 5).

VII, 82, 3 (2). Total, 2.

c. Following other past forms.

VI, 7, 1. Total, 1.

* Heynacher (Sprachgebranch Caesar's im bellum Gallicum) finds 36 exceptions. The difference is due to the fact that he has counted in those retained by *repraesentatio* in indirect discourse, while I have not done so. See Chap. IX, I.

4. The aorist following an aorist in the relation of "coincidence." For cases in which "coincidence" brings about sequence see Chap. IX, II, 1. Some of the past future conditions in Chap. V, II, 2, also stand in this relation.

IV, 13, 4; 16, 1. V, 8, 4. VI, 30, 3. VII, 57, 3. Total, 5

5. The aorist in "pseudo-coincidence". For lack of a better name I prefer to call by this one the relation of, for example, *potuit*, in such phrases as *quam maxime potuit*, to its principal verb. For cases in which "pseudo-coincidence" brings about sequence see Chap. IX, II, 2. In this relation the tenses agree so thoroughly that even a variation between historical present and aorist is not allowed. But in the five examples in which the clause depends on a perfect participle the aorist is used, a fact which may possibly make it seem that in classifying other clauses depending on perfect participles I ought to have regarded the participle as an aorist rather than as a pluperfect.

a. Following an aorist.

I, 7, 1; 7, 2. II, 33, 4. III, 9, 2; 9, 8. V, 39, 1; 39, 2; 49, 7; 58, 6. VII, 9, 3; 43, 4; 55, 8; 63, 2. Total, 13.

b. Following a perfect participle.

I, 37, 5. IV, 21, 9; 35, 3. VII, 68, 2; 74, 1. Total, 5.

6. The aorist following an aorist in the relation of "congruence".

II, 11, 6. IV, 12, 5. Total, 2.

7. The aorist following an aorist in a "balancing clause".

VI, 30, 2. Total, 1.

8. The aorist in a *cum-inversum* clause.

VI, 7, 2; 8, 1. VII, 26, 3 (2). Total, 4.

9. The aorist in a *cum* clause of date. A clause which brings in from outside the matter in hand some event by which to date it is naturally likely to use an aorist.

VI, 12, 1. Total 1.

Total for the section, 111.

III. Indicative exceptions not resulting from a fixed idiom. Of these 1, 2, 3, and some under 4, result from the necessary relations of thought, leaving very few—a part of those under 4—for which I can see no necessity, though in most of them the exception seems natural enough. They are divided here according to tense usage rather than syntactical construction, though a division according to the latter would have been serviceable too. The dependent constructions included here, and the number of examples of each, are as follows: Relative clauses, 148; causal and concessive with *quod*,

etc., and *etsi*, 19; substantive *quod*, 2; *quam* after comparatives, 2. The relative clauses may be further divided as follows: Non-essential (parenthetical and the like, including *ut* meaning as), 117; determinative (telling what person or thing is meant), 24; generalizing, 7.

1. The perfect where Caesar uses such expressions as *ut ante dictum est*. This group might not unreasonably have been put under II, since it comes very near to being a fixed idiom.

I, 16, 2; 49, 3. II, 1, 1; 9, 3; 18, 1; 22, 1; 29, 1. III, 5, 2; 10, 1; 15, 1; 26, 2. IV, 4, 1; 16, 2; 17, 1; 28, 1; 35, 1. V, 2, 2; 6, 1; 19, 1; 22, 1; 49, 2; 56, 3. VI, 2, 1; 8, 9; 34, 1; 35, 3; 38, 1; 40, 4. VII, 17, 1; 25, 1; 37, 1; 48, 1; 70, 1; 76, 1; 79, 2; 83, 8; 85, 4. There is one instance of a similar present, VI, 24, 2. Total, 38.

2. The present or perfect following a past tense. This combination of tenses is used with great freedom by Caesar in describing places or people, giving a still existing cause for a past act, the expression of general truths, etc. But in Latin even more than in English such things may be spoken of also as they were at the time of the narrative; that is, in imperfects and pluperfects. This happens as freely in independent sentences as in dependent, so that such imperfects and pluperfects are not to be regarded as due to the influence of sequence. For a reason that will appear later I have given in separate lists the presents and perfects which are used in clauses with causal or adversative meaning, whether expressed formally by *quod*, *etsi*, etc., or only implied in relative clauses. Of the verbs included in these latter lists, in the independent sentences 9 are with *nam*, etc.; 1, without; in the dependent sentences, 15 are with *quod*, etc.; 2, with *etsi*, and 12 are in non-essential relative clauses.

a. A present following a past.

A. Without causal or adversative meaning. 1, 10, 5; 12, 1. III, 1, 5. V, 3, 1 (3); 11, 8; 18, 1; 21, 3; 56, 2 (2). VI, 32, 3 (2). VII, 57, 1; 58, 3. Total, 15. With causal or adversative meaning. II, 17, 4 (2); 30, 4. III, 19, 6. VII, 3, 2 (4). Total, 8.

B. Without causal or adversative meaning. I, 8, 1 (2); 10, 1; 10, 5; 16, 5; 27, 4; 28, 4; 38, 1; 54, 1. II, 3, 1; 4, 10; 5, 4; 34 (2). III, 1, 1; 1, 4; 9, 1; 11, 1; 13, 4; 20, 1; 20, 2; 22, 1; 22, 2; 23, 3. IV, 1, 1; 1, 10; 3, 3; 6, 4; 20, 3; 28, 2. V, 1, 2; 3, 4; 24, 4; 53, 6; 54, 2. VI, 7, 8; 10, 5; 24, 2 (2); 29, 4 (3); 30, 3; 31, 5; 32, 1; 33, 1; 33, 2; 33, 3; 35, 5. VII, 4, 6; 5, 4; 7, 5; 8, 2; 24, 4; 55, 4; 59, 5; 68, 1; 75, 4 (2). Total, 59. With causal or adversative meaning. I, 2, 3; 6, 2 (2); 38, 4. II, 24, 4. III, 8, 3; 12, 1; 18, 6; 21, 3. IV, 5, 1 (2); 20, 1. V, 33, 4; 39, 1. VI, 29, 1; 35, 6. VII, 2, 2; 3, 3; 22, 1; 22, 2 (2); 26, 4; 30, 3; 35, 2; 40, 7; 64, 4. Total, 26.

b. A perfect following a past.

A. Without causal or adversative meaning. V, 56, 2. Total, 1. With causal or adversative meaning. I, 12, 4. V, 33, 1. Total, 2.

B. Without causal or adversative meaning. III, 9, 9. IV, 24, 1; 29, 1. V, 1, 2; 7, 3. VI, 31, 3. VII, 21, 1; 42, 2. Total, 8. With causal or adversative meaning. I, 16, 2. III, 26, 4. VII, 75, 2. Total, 3.

3. Imperfects and pluperfects depending on presents. In each of these cases it will be found that the imperfect or pluperfect is necessarily used because really in relation with the time of the narrative, though its clause depends syntactically on a present.

I, 6, 2. V, 54, 5. VI, 32, 4. VII, 82, 3. Total, 4.

4. The aorist following a past tense.

a. Phrases like "as actually did happen", and "as he afterwards learned". Here the aorist is the only thing possible.

I, 22, 1. II, 17, 2; 32, 4. 33, 2. V, 8, 6; 58, 4. Total, 6.

b. The aorist following an aorist in a relation somewhat like that of "coincidence". Here the aorist is more natural than any other tense.

I, 28, 4; 51, 1. II, 21, 1. IV, 8, 1. V, 2, 3. VII, 8, 3. Total, 6.

c. The aorist following an aorist in a sort of a summarizing generalizing clause, instead of imperfect or pluperfect following an imperfect. Here the aorist is not unnatural.

II, 21, 6 (2); IV, 14, 4. VI, 31, 3. (Here *erant* would have given the entirely wrong meaning, "who happened to be at the time"). VII, 62, 9. Total, 5.

d. Aorist where an imperfect or pluperfect would for some special reason have given the wrong impression.

I, 29, 3. (I think imperfect of periphrastic would have been strictly right, but too definite; the pluperfect would have meant "after they reached home", which is probably not the thing intended). II, 29, 4. (Almost a coordinate relative). IV, 1, 1 (2). VII, 5, 6. Total, 5.

e. The aorist where I should have expected an imperfect or pluperfect. The aorist here is sometimes used with an apparent wish to give emphasis or point to a statement.

II, 35, 4. III, 16, 2. V, 44, 4; 54, 4. VI, 42, 3. VII, 12, 2; 28, 5 (2); 31, 1; 75, 1; 84, 4. Total, 11.

5. The present following an imperfect subjunctive in present conclusion contrary to fact.

A. VII, 77, 6. Total, 1.

Total for the section, A, 27; B, 171.

Total for the chapter, A, 27; B, 282; C, 13.

CHAPTER XI.

COORDINATE RELATIVE SENTENCES AND CLAUSES.

By the term "coordinate relative" I understand all the relatives that may fairly be said to perform the functions of coordinating conjunctions; in other words, all those which may fairly be translated by "and he", "but he", etc. This use of the relative appears most commonly at the beginning of what to us seem wholly independent sentences. That the Romans had not quite the same feeling about them is shown, as will be said presently, by their treatment of them in indirect discourse. But besides these apparently independent sentences there are coordinate relative clauses much more closely connected with a main clause. That these were subordinate, not coordinate, to Caesar's feeling, is shown by his treatment of them in indirect discourse. Nevertheless, these clauses do not give the situation of affairs, or subordinate ideas, but state coordinate facts; and the same tense is naturally to be expected as in the main clause, just as the same tense is commonly used in clauses connected by coordinating conjunctions. It has seemed fair to treat the apparently independent sentences as really independent, for the purposes of this paper. Accordingly those which contain imperfects and pluperfects have been included among independent sentences in the statistics given in the preceding chapters; and those which contain aorists have not been given at all. In this chapter I give merely the statistics for them, not the examples themselves. Of the more nearly subordinate clauses, those which contain imperfects and pluperfects in consequence of their depending on main clauses with their verbs in the same tenses might have been given in previous chapters, among other dependent verbs whose tenses are in sequence; and those which contain aorists might have been given in Chap. X among other exceptions to sequence. But I have preferred to reserve all for this chapter. At the end of the chapter will be found the complete statistics including the examples here given.

I. Apparently independent sentences. For these, as has been said, only the statistics are given.

Present or perfect following present or perfect, 13.

Present or perfect following a past tense, 5.

Present subjunctive following a future, 1.

Imperfect or pluperfect following a past tense, 1.

Imperfect or pluperfect following an imperfect or pluperfect, 30.

Imperfect or pluperfect following an aorist, 18.

Aorist following a present tense, 4.

Aorist following an imperfect or pluperfect, 16.

Aorist following an aorist, 101.

Aorist following imperfect subjunctive in unreal condition, 1.

Infinitive in indirect discourse, 11.

Subjunctive for imperative in indirect discourse, 1.

With this number of infinitives in relative clauses should be compared the examples given under II, 1.

II. Clauses.

1. Coordinate relative clauses in indirect discourse. It is not correct, so far as Caesar's practice is concerned, to say that such clauses regularly employ the infinitive.

a. It has already been noticed that in the apparently independent sentence Caesar has eleven instances of the use of the infinitive in indirect discourse. The following examples of the subjunctive in sentences which to my feeling are quite as independent show that Caesar felt them to be dependent clauses.

I, 20, 3. II, 31, 4. V, 29, 7. VII, 14, 10; 20, 5; 39, 4. Total, 6.

b. The following examples are to my feeling coordinate relative clauses, not independent sentences. Caesar has no example of an infinitive in such clauses, showing that to him they were subordinate, not coordinate.

I, 31, 10; 37, 3; 45, 2 (2). II, 14, 2. V, 21, 2; 26, 4; 53, 1. VII, 5, 5; 14, 7; 20, 7; 29, 4; 44, 3. Total, 14.

2. With present indicative. These are all in sequence.

I, 1, 1; 1, 3. IV, 1, 4; 2, 3. V, 13, 1. VI, 13, 1 (2); 13, 2; 13, 8; 16, 4. Total, 10.

3. With imperfect indicative. These are all in sequence.

I, 16, 3. II, 1, 4. Total, 2.

4. With aorist indicative. These are all out of sequence.

I, 53, 3. II, 15, 2; 31, 2. IV, 4, 1 (2); 7, 2. V, 1, 3; 48, 10. VII, 63, 7. Total, 9.

In giving the following complete statistics I do not include the figures given in I of the present chapter. Aside from them we have found 952 dependent indicatives and 1881 subjunctives in sequence, and 291 dependent indicatives and 13 subjunctives out of sequence.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PROOF OF A SEQUENCE FEELING.

I hope I have now shown that the tenses of the subjunctive and indicative alike are used in accordance with definite meanings of their own, both in sequence and out of it; and that the choice of tenses is determined by the meaning just as much in one mood as the other, barring a few idioms.

But this does not prove that there is no such thing as sequence. We have yet to consider the reasons for the great disproportion between the exceptions in the indicative and those in the subjunctive.

Leaving out the idioms, Professor Hale's explanation is that in the mass the indicative constructions are less closely connected in thought with the principal clauses than are the subjunctive ones. This is undeniably good so far as it goes. Though most of the indicative constructions are as closely connected as the subjunctive are, yet the indicative relative clauses are all of such a nature as to be suitable for bringing in statements disconnected with the narrative, and hence show many exceptions. We have already seen that most of the indicative exceptions which do not fall under one of the fixed idioms are in relative clauses. But if we can compare any constructions which are to be found with like meanings in indicative and subjunctive, and with no closer connection of thought in the one mood than the other; and if in the indicative we find a considerable number of exceptions, while there are few or none in the subjunctive; we shall then be forced to assume that some other influence is at work. Such a set of examples is given best in Caesar by the causal and adversative clauses. When Caesar wishes to express a past reason for or against a past act, he uses with apparent indifference the subjunctive with *cum* or indicatives with *quod*, etc., with relatives, or independently with or without *nam*,* etc. But Caesar is very fond of giving a still existing reason for a past act, and the verb which expresses the reason must of course be in the present. Now in every case of this kind Caesar uses one of the

*This point seems so certain that I have not thought it necessary to make an independent count of the clauses with *quod*, etc. and *cum*, but have availed myself of the statistics of Heynacher (*Sprachgebrauch Caesar's im bellum Gallicum*). He finds, of *quod* causal with the indicative, 136; of *quod* causal with the subjunctive of indirect discourse, 44; of *quoniam*, 16; of *etsi* and *tametsi* with the indicative, 23. In all 219; but this number includes the clauses which are out of sequence as well as those in sequence. Of *cum* causal with principal tenses he quotes Proksch as giving 18. With imperfect and pluperfect he says he once counted some 70, but has come to find but 20. Probably most counts would fall some where between the two limits, and if one counted, as would be fair for my purpose, all those in which there is any causal feeling, probably there would be found more than 70. Of *cum* concessive he finds 18 sure cases and some doubtful ones. In all, at the least possible calculation, 56; and including those fairly to be counted for my purpose, at least 106.

indicative constructions, avoiding the subjunctive (See Chap. X, III, 2). I can see no reason for this except that he had a feeling that the subjunctive tenses ought not to be used in connections which we call out of sequence.* It must be noted however that he has one aorist subjunctive exception (See Chap. X, I, 2) and another in indirect discourse (See Chap. IX, I, 7). It must be admitted that this number of examples in a single construction is not a large foundation on which to build a theory. But on them, supported by such statistics as I have been able to secure for these and other constructions in other authors, and further supported by theoretical considerations, I venture to offer a theory as fairly probable.

I believe that while there was no sequence feeling which could force a subjunctive tense to be used inconsistently with its true meaning, or could wrest those tenses from their true meanings except in few constructions, there was a feeling, existing for the subjunctive and not for the indicative, which made a failure in sequence seem strange in the subjunctive but not in the indicative. That consequently, whenever the relations of thought made an exception to sequence necessary, there was an unconscious tendency to avoid subjunctive constructions and use indicatives instead.

I believe that this feeling exerted an unconscious influence upon the whole form of many sentences, with the result that the non-sequent ideas were often thrown into indicative relative clauses rather than expressed, as they would otherwise have been, in some entirely different subjunctive constructions. But this is too delicate a matter to be reached by statistics. There are, however, a few constructions of the indicative which correspond so closely to those of the subjunctive that a comparison can be made with ease and, as I think, with decisive results.

Best of all, and for Caesar the only one, is the causal-adversative relation, which has already been discussed.

Something might be done with the expression of general truths in indirect questions. The single sentence in which Caesar has a

*It may be objected that there is strictly no such thing as a separate causal-adversative use of the subjunctive. That it is only a special case of the *cum* clause which is used to give the attendant circumstances, the situation. That it can therefore be used only to give the attendant circumstances or the situation resulting from a past act, and is not the natural construction to use when one wishes to bring in a cause, etc., from a different time-sphere. My reply would be two fold. In the first place, I believe this is largely true and for the origin of the clause I believe it is quite true. But this is only a particular instance of what I believe "sequence of tenses" is in all constructions. I believe *all* subjunctive constructions were fitted, at least at their origin, to express only such thought relations as were in sequence. But in the second place, the ground of the objection is wholly true only at the origin. For that the causal-adversative construction was differentiated from the temporal clause is shown by the fact that it spread into the primary tenses, while the temporal subjunctive did not. And Caesar's two instances of the use of the aorist in this construction suffice to show that he *could* use other tenses than the imperfect and pluperfect when he liked.

present depending on a past is of this kind (See Chap. X, I, 4). It has already been said that the imperfect in such expressions is not, in one sense, to be accounted for by sequence, for it is used in independent sentences as well as in dependent clauses. But I believe that, if enough examples were at hand to prove it, it would be found that the proportion of exceptional subjunctives is smaller than of exceptional indicatives; and in that case I should say that the sequence feeling had led to the choice of one tense out of two which were equally possible so far as meaning was concerned.

A result may be expressed by an *ut* or by an independent sentence with an illative conjunction. In an author fond of stating present results of past acts I should expect to find a larger proportion of exceptions in the independent sentences. Here, however, the sequence feeling has a greater resistance to overcome, since, to avoid an exception, it would be necessary to break up what should perhaps be a single sentence; and the results could not be expected to be as striking as in some other cases.

In some cases there would be a possible choice between a substantive result and a substantive *quod* clause, and I should expect some evidence from comparing these cases.

Something might result from the study of relative clauses, for a rhetorical determinative, for example, might occasionally be used instead of a characterizing clause. But this again is almost too delicate a matter for statistics.

Besides such proof by statistics, I believe a sure theoretical ground can be given for expecting to find such a sequence feeling in existence.

The original meanings of the subjunctive have been spoken of in Chapter V. From constructions with these meanings I assume that the constructions showing all the other meanings have been derived. I accept Professor Hale's explanation of the processes, so far as they have yet been given out; but it is of little consequence for my argument whether or not one accepts his theories in all details, provided one agrees with the main proposition.

The subjunctive originally expressed various feelings,—will, wish, “ideal certainty,” etc. When used before the dependent stage these feelings must, in each instance of their expression, either have grown out of the situation spoken of and have been expressed by a tense of the same time-sphere (true parataxis), or else have expressed the speaker's present feelings, being a sort of digression from the matter in hand (true independence). From this true parataxis was developed hypotaxis, in which, so long as any con-

struction retains the original meaning of its mood, the tenses will almost or quite invariably be in sequence. Of course, *repraesentatio* may at any time cause the substitution of the tense that would have been used by the actor; but this is no more an exception to sequence than the historical present is. For example, a command or purpose would be felt as growing out of the situation spoken of, and would be in a tense of the same time-sphere as the verb of commanding, etc.: "he commands, he is to go;" "he commanded, he was to go," or by *repraesentatio* "he commaded, 'he is to go.'" And the consecutive idea must be similarly connected in thought with the situation: "he is so good as that he would help you" (in a time future to the present); "he was so good as that he was likely to help you" (in a time future to the past). The parenthetical purpose clause would, of course, show many exceptions, from its very nature, but I can hardly think of other such constructions. Consequently, whatever tense constructions are assumed to have existed before the derived meanings of the subjunctive sprang up were practically all in what we call sequence, and this could hardly fail to start a habit which would make itself felt as soon as the other meanings appeared.

But in the indicative clauses no such thing was to be expected. The indicative must from the start have been used to express facts from all times, and two facts from different time-spheres could and would easily be brought together in the relation, for example, of cause and effect; and these clauses could be connected by conjunctions and relatives. So while the subjunctive had, by the very nature of its meanings, to be in sequence, the indicative just as inevitably had many exceptions. The tenses of both moods were still used with entire freedom, but in one the conditions were favorable for the growth of a sequence feeling, in the other they were not.

If so much be admitted I do not see how the rest can be disputed. Certainly I do not see how one who agrees with Professor Hale's theory of the result clauses can consistently deny sequence elsewhere. This theory is that the past future subjunctive in such a sentence as "he was so good as that he would help" went nearly or quite over into such an aorist meaning as "that he did help", but that because the imperfect would be used in the original sentence the habit still remained in the developed construction*. What

*Professor Hale feels that this is too strong a statement of his position. His belief is rather that to a Roman the imperfect carried always much of the "such as to" idea, while the aorist means "so that he did". His treatment of the construction is given in A. J. P. VIII, pp. 49-53. I find there no quotable passage to bring out this point, though there are indications of it here and there.

is this but sequencê? And, too, it is sequence acting under the hardest possible conditions, since it had to keep a tense form after the force had become nearly or quite equivalent to that of another tense. If this explanation of the origin of the use of the tense is possible (and I accept it) then surely it may be admitted that all along the line, wherever a developed construction arose, there must have been the habit at the start of using it only in sequence; and that, as nothing happened to break up this habit, it must have continued. For in no other case, except in the breakdown of the *priusquam*, etc., clause, where precisely the same thing happened, did the habit have so much pressure to resist; since only in those clauses, did the developed construction take on an aorist tense meaning.

The chief constructions in which this development appears are: From "ideal certainty",—clauses of result, characterizing clauses, causal and adversative clauses, and *cum* clauses; from the volitive,—the clauses of propriety and the concessive clauses with *ut*, *ne* or *quavis*; from a yet uncertain source,—indirect questions and indirect discourse. Professor Hale's *Cum-Constructions* gives the process of development of all the first group from the subjunctive of "ideal certainty". In all of them except result and some characterizing clauses it will be seen that the act or state of the subordinate clause is regularly used to describe a situation, so that the imperfect and pluperfect simply take on the meanings of the corresponding indicative tenses instead of the aorist. However, having once taken on the meanings of the corresponding indicative tenses, there seems to me to be nothing to keep them from being used out of sequence except the habit already spoken of. So, too, the constructions derived from the volitive take on meanings equivalent to those of the descriptive indicative tenses, and seem to be held in sequence only by habit. Although the origin of the subjunctive in dependent questions and dependent clauses of the indirect discourse is still uncertain, at least there seems no reason for supposing that anything happened in their development which would interfere with the growth and persistence of the habit.

On the the other hand nothing happened in the growth of the indicative constructions to make a similar feeling arise for this mood. More than that, habit did settle down on certain non-sequence idioms in the indicative; for example, the aorist in *postquam*-clauses in contradistinction to the tenses of the stage in *cum*-clauses. These idioms must have had a tendency to check the rise of a sequence feeling if any had threatened.

To sum up then in the briefest possible form the results of this paper: I believe that in Caesar every tense of the subjunctive and indicative alike has its own meaning and is never wrested from that meaning by a rule of sequence. But I believe also that Caesar had a feeling of sequence that led him to avoid irregular uses of the subjunctive, and gave him a tendency to use an equivalent indicative construction if possible, or otherwise to recast the sentence. I believe further that other writers will show much the same preciseness of meaning in the tenses, and the same tendency to avoid irregular subjunctives.

THE RESULTS OF AN EXAMINATION OF OTHER AUTHORS.

I append a bare summary of the results of two carefully written and verified papers prepared at my suggestion as Master's theses in the University of Kansas. Both studies were intended to test the theory that where an exception to sequence was logically necessary and there was a choice between indicative and subjunctive constructions the Latin writer preferred the indicative.

Miss Mary E. Frost, in 1898, made an examination of the usage of Tacitus as shown in the *Annals*, I-VI, with the following results: In causal clauses and independent sentences with causal meaning, 235 indicatives in sequence, 74 out of sequence; 79 subjunctives in sequence, 3 out of sequence. In adversative clauses, 7 indicatives in sequence, 3 out of sequence; 49 subjunctives in sequence, 3 out of sequence. In result clauses and independent sentences with result meaning, 10 indicatives in sequence, 86 out of sequence; 42 subjunctives in sequence, 10 out of sequence.

Mr. Tenny Frank, in 1899, made a similar examination of the usage of Sallust (both the *Catiline* and the *Jugurthine War*), with the following results: In causal and adversative clauses and independent sentences of similar meanings, 107 indicatives in sequence, 22 out of sequence; 25 subjunctives in sequence, 0 out of sequence. In result clauses and independent sentences with result meaning, 3 indicatives in sequence, 22 out of sequence; 21 subjunctives in sequence, 0 out of sequence.

Mr. Frank furthermore, by the use of Merguet's "Lexikon," examined Cicero's usage in causal and adversative clauses as shown in the Verrine Orations, with the following results: In causal clauses, 84 indicatives in sequence, 24 out of sequence; 85 subjunctives in sequence, 1 out of sequence. In adversative clauses, 9 indicatives in sequence, 4 out of sequence; 22 subjunctives in sequence, 0 out of sequence.

